00065180

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-1.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

A

HISTORY OF ROMAN LITERATURE

BY

W. S. TEUFFEL.
PROFESSOR AT TÜBINGEN.

65180

TRANSLATED, WITH THE AUTHOR'S SANCTION,

BY

WILHELM WAGNER, PH. D.
OF THE JOHANNEUM, HAMBURG.

VOL. I:

THE REPUBLICAN PERIOD.

LONDON:
GEORGE BELL AND SONS;
CAMBRIDGE: DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO.
1873.

00065180

PREFACE.

In issuing the translation of a work which was, directly on its appearance, acknowledged as the standard work on the history of Roman Literature and recommended as such at almost all German Universities — in consequence of which the first edition of the German work was exhausted almost two or three months after its completion —, the translator begs to draw attention to the fact that the first part of the English edition down to p. 338 of the first volume, had already been printed off, when he received the news of the appearance of a second edition of the German original. On applying to Professor Teuffel, the translator was informed that for various reasons it had been impossible to the author to acquaint him with this fact before, so that perhaps the new edition might have been consulted before printing the translation. This is, indeed, an inconvenience, but the table given in our 'Addenda' containing a comparative list of the numbers of the second edition and the most important additions made in it, is calculated to remedy this defect as far as it appears possible at present. From giving more and from, in fact, noting down every discrepancy in detail the translator has been prevented by numerous engagements and the duties of his position, not to speak of the anxieties of the winter now passing away, in which his family and himself had to struggle through much malady and ill-health.

The German work is not a great achievement in point of style; it is a store-house of learning and exact scholarship rather than a brilliant composition. The translator is aware that the general taste of his own countrymen and that of English readers differ in this respect, and there is not the slightest doubt but that many English readers will pronounce the present work "dry and heavy" — but this very feature may recommend it to the real scholar who knows that a meretricious and brilliant style with striking and ingenious displays of wit and of clever *aperçus* often hides superficiality and shallowness. I have not endeavoured to improve upon the style of the work, though my personal preference might perhaps have led me to adopt an easier style in many parts. I have more than once found it difficult adequately to render the author's meaning in English, and am aware that my translation is sometimes awkward, because I endeavoured to be rather faithful than elegant.

In conclusion, the readers are referred to an article (by Professor M. Hertz) on the latest works on Roman Literature, in the Academy, of August 1, 1871, vol. 2 p. 380—383.

HAMBURG,
MARCH 17, 1873.

PART I:

CONTAINING A GENERAL VIEW OF THE SUBJECT.

1. The Romans lacked the versatility, manysidedness and imaginative power of the Greeks; their eminent qualities are sober and acute thought, and firmness and perseverance of will. Their intellect was directed to the practical, and sometimes degenerated into egotism and cunning, just as their perseverance often turned into obstinacy and pedantry. In the domain of state and law these qualities accomplished great and enduring results, while they were decidedly unfavourable to art and literature.

1. Cic. Tusc. I 1, 2: quae tanta gravitas, quae tanta constantia, magnitudo animi, probitas, fides, quae tam excellens in omni genere virtus in ullis fuit, ut sit cum maioribus nostris comparanda? (3) Doctrina Graecia nos et omni litterarum genere superabat etc. De imp. Pomp. 20, 60: maiores nostros semper in pace consuetudini, in bello utilitati paruisse. Tac. dial. 5: si ad utilitatem vitae omnia consilia factaque nostra dirigenda sunt. Plin. N. H. XXV 2: nostri, omnium utilitatum et virtutum rapacissimi. Quintil. XII 2, 7: ego illum quem instituo romanum quendam velim esse sapientem, qui non secretis disceptationibus, sed rerum experimentis atque operibus vere civilem virum exhibeat. — Liv. XXIII 14, 1: insita (Romanorum) animis industria. Liv. XLII 62: romana constantia, cf. ib. XXX 7: romana in adversis rebus constantia, and Polyb. III 75 extr. XXVII 8: ἴδιον τοῦτο πάντῃ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἔθος καὶ πάτριόν ἐστι, τὸ κατὰ μὲν τὰς ἐλαττώσεις ἀνθαδέστατους καὶ βαρυτάτους φαίνεσθαι, κατὰ δὲ τὰς ἐπιτυχίας ὡς μετριωτάτους. ib. I 39: ὄντες ἐν παντὶ φιλότιμοι διαφερόντως. — Scipio Africanus minor ap. Macr. Sat. III 14, 7: eunt in ludum histrionum, discunt cantare quae maiores nostri ingenuis probro ducier voluerunt. Ib. 10: Cato, cui ... etiam cantare non serii hominis videtur, Sen. Controv. p. 49, 1 Bu.: cantandi saltandique obscena studia. Tac. dial. 10: in Graecia, ubi ludicras quoque artes exercere honestum est. All occupations without immediate practical tendency are artes leviores (Cic. Brut. 1, 3) and mediocres (Cic. de or. I 2, 6), studia leviora (Cic. de or. I 49, 212. Cat. 14, 50) and minora (Cic. Brut. 18, 70).

2. On the national character of the Romans see R. Ihering, Geist des röm. Rechts I espec. p. 291—313. Bernhardy, History of the Rom. Lit. p. 2 sq. W. Teuffel, on the character of Horace p. 23—34. Bunsen, Egypt's place &c. I p. 194 etc. K. F. Hermann, History of Civilisation among the Greeks and Romans II p. 26 etc. Mommsen, Roman History in many places, e. g. I (sec. ed.) p. 28 sq. C. Peter, Studies on Roman History, (1863) p. 116 sqq. Pantke, A Parallel between the national character of the Greeks and Romans, Vienna 1854. E. Zeller, Religion and Philosophy among the Romans (Berl. 1866) p. 8 sqq. — Kōpke, on the aesthetic views of the Romans as compared with the Greeks, Berlin 1867. L. Friedländer, on the artistic taste of the Romans in the Imperial period, Königsberg 1851. K. F. Hermann, on the artistic taste of the Romans and their place in the history of ancient art, Göttingen 1855.

2. As long as the peculiar character of the Roman nation remained unaltered, literary occupation was thought admissible only so far as it was of practical value. The authors were for long of foreign origin, little respected, and had to struggle with poverty; hence they became tainted with the Roman indifference to form and style. It is true that the importance of eloquence as a means of political influence, the value of information in regard to events that had taken place, and the importance of jurisprudence were recognized at an early time; but all other fields of knowledge were all the more neglected; poetry was tolerated only for the purposes of worship, and during a long time limited to a single species. Only in the course of the sixth century (A. V. C.), the increased acquaintance with Greek life and literature produced new ideas, interests and requirements.

1. Cic. p. Planc. 27, 66: M. Catonis illud quod in principio scripsit Originum suarum semper magnificum et praeclarum putavi: clarorum hominum atque magnorum non minus otii quam negotii rationem exstare oportere. The same Cato (ap. Gell. N. A. XI 2, 5) says in praise of ancient Rome: poeticae artis honos non erat. si quis in ea re studebat aut sese ad convivia adplicabat grassator vocabatur. Festus p. 333a M.: scribas proprio nomine antiqui et librarios et poetas vocabant. The literary activity of old Cato sufficiently shows what branches of literature were held admissible; he feared ὡς ἀποβαλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ πράγματα γραμμάτων ἑλληνικῶν ἀναπλησθέντες (Plut. Cato mai. 23). Cic. (Tusc. I 1—3.) gives a sketch of the part taken by the Romans in literature.

2. Voorduin, de artibus et doctrinis in quibus Romani elaboraverunt, Ghent 1822. 150 pp. 4. M. Hertz, the Authors and the reading public of Rome. Berlin 1853. 45 pp. 8.

3. Of the various kinds of poetry, dramatic poetry seems after all to be most in conformity with the character of the Roman people. Like all Italians, the Romans possessed

a quick eye for all peculiarities of outward appearance, the talent of close observation, lively imitation and quick repartee. Hence it comes that improvisation and songs of a jocular and abusive character, poetical dialogues and amoebaean ditties are found in Italy at a very remote date.

1. Specimens of italum acetum (Hor. S. I 7, 32 comp. maledica civitas Cic. p. Cael. 16, 38; Romanorum facetiae, Trebell. Gallien. 9) are furnished by the numerous surnames which were originally nicknames taken from corporal peculiarities; see Quintil I. O. I 4, 25. Fr. Ellendt, de cognomine etc. (Königsberg 1853) p. 9—22. This quality was further developed by the political and legal quarrels of subsequent times. Cf. Cic. de or. II 54 sqq. Quintil. VI 3.

2. The 'occentationes' were prohibited in the XII tables, on punishment of flogging. — Plaut. Aul. III 2, 31 sq.: nisi reddi mihi vasa iubes pipulo hic differam ante aedes. — For the satirical songs on the triumphator, see below 74. — The custom is described by Suet. Vesp. 19: in funere Favor archimimus personam eius (i. e. Vespasiani) ferens imitansque, ut est mos, facta ac dicta vivi. — The amoebaean form prevails in the songs of the fratres arvales, the Fescennine songs, the songs used in the triumphs, songs of beggars (Schol. Hor. Ep. I 17, 48), shepherds' songs (amant alterna Camenae, Virg. Ecl. III 59.)

3. A certain liking for dialogue long prevails in Roman literature, e. g. in the instance of the jurisprudent Junius Brutus and C. Curio. Its popularity appears e. g. from the inscription of Aesernia I. R. N. 5078.

4. On festive occasions merry performances of this kind took place even in public to the accompaniment of a tibia and with dancing. The actors were disguised, in accordance with the fondness of Southern nations for mummery, their faces being painted or masked. There was only a small step from the farcical representation of an actual event to exhibiting a fictitious action, in which the plot was invented and set down, but the detail of the execution left to the performers. Popular performances of this kind were the Fescennine songs, the Saturae, the Mimi, and later on the Atellanae.

1. Virg. Ge. II 385 sqq.: Ausonii . . coloni versibus incomptis ludunt risuque soluto oraque corticibus sumunt horrenda cavatis etc. Tibull. II 1, 55: agricola . . minio suffusus . . rubenti primus inexperta duxit ab arte choros.

2. Mommsen R. H. I². p. 206—208.

5. The name of the Fescenninae is derived from the town of Fescennium in the South of Etruria, though they belong in general to central Italy. They made part of rustic merrymakings, being

performed on occasions of rejoicing, the performers indulging in mutual abuse and coarse jokes in the native and unrefined taste of the populace, etc. Though this custom was originally also practiced on rustic festivities (e. g. at harvest-time, and the festivals of Tellus and Silvanus), it was gradually confined to narrower limits and restricted to weddings. When, after the downfall of the Republic, the Fescenninae were drawn into the domain of artistic poetry, they were partly practiced in their scoptic character and partly used at weddings.

1. K. Zell, Writings during my Vacations II. p. 121 sqq. O. Müller, on the Etrurians II. p. 284 sqq. R. Klotz, Hist. of Lat. Lit. 1. p. 292 sqq. W. Corssen, Origines poes. p. 124—132. A. Th. Broman, de versibus fesc. Upsala 1852. 18 pp. 4. A. Rossbach, röm. Ehe (1853) S. 340—345.

2. Festus in the abridgement of Paul. Diac. p. 85 M.: Fescennini versus, qui canebantur in nuptiis, ex urbe Fescennina dicuntur allati, sive ideo dicti quia fascinum putabantur arcere. The immediate connexion of the name with the name of the town should not be denied, witness the grammatical formation of the word and the analogy of the Atellanae. But beyond this, a common derivation from fascinus = φαλλός (in its symbolic meaning of fertility) which had its place both in rustic festivities and at weddings (Rossbach p. 343 sqq.), may be readily admitted.

3. Hor. Ep. II 1, 139 sqq.: agricolae prisci .. condita post frumenta levantes tempore festo corpus et ipsum animum . . . Tellurem porco, Silvanum lacte piabant, floribus et vino Genium .. (145) Fescennina per hunc inventa licentia morem versibus alternis (comp. Liv. VII 2, 7 and Sen. Med. 108) opprobria rustica fudit, libertasque recurrentes accepta per annos lusit amabiliter, donec iam saevus apertam in rabiem coepit verti iocus etc. etc. Liv. VII 3, 7: non .. Fescennino versu similem incompositum temere ac rudem alternis iaciebant. Lucan. II 368 sq.: non soliti lusere sales nec more Sabino excepit tristis convicia festa maritus. Macrob. Sat. III 14, 9: M. Cato senatorem non ignobilem Caecilium .. Fescenninum vocat, probably on account of his habit of ridicularia fundere, iocos dicere (ib.) Cf. Fest. v. spatiator, p. 344 b. M.

4. Catull. 61, 122 sq.: ne diu taceat (at a wedding) procax Fescennina locutio. Sen. Med. 107 sqq.: concesso iuvenes ludite iurgio. hinc illinc iuvenes mittite carmina. rara est in dominos iusta licentia. V. 113 sq.: festa dicax fundat convicia fescenninus, solvat turba iocos. Sen. Controv. VII 21 p. 223, 16 sq. Bu.: inter nuptiales fescenninos (so Plin. N. H. XV: 22, 86; cf. also Serv. on Aen. VII 695: Fescenninum oppidum est, ubi nuptialia inventa sunt carmina) in crucem generi nostri iocabantur. Auson. cento nupt. (Id. XIII): Fescenninos amat celebritas nuptialis verborumque petulantiam notus vetere instituto ludus admittit. Claudian. Fescenn. 4, 29 sqq.: ducant pervigiles carmina tibiae permissisque iocis turba licentior exsultet tetricis libera legibus.

5. Catullus' first epithalamium (LXI) is an imitation (V. 122 sqq.) of the national custom. Comp. Auson. Id. XIII s. f.: quid Anniani fescenninos (loquar)? Of Claudianus we possess in nuptias Honorii Aug. et Mariae fescennina (4 poems in different metres). On the other hand see Macrob. Sat. II 4, 21: temporibus triumviralibus Pollio, cum fescenninos in eum Augustus scripsisset, ait: at ego taceo, non est enim facile in eum scribere qui potest proscribere.

6. According to Diomedes III p. 475 P. = 479, 12 K., the (later) grammarians called the amphimacer or cretic also fescenninus and amphimeres. But the original metre of the Fescenninae (as far as they may have been at all metrical) was no doubt the Saturnian line. The Fescenninae never made their way to the stage.

6. In the Saturae the dramatic element seems to have prevailed from the beginning. Most likely, they were merry performances of the country clowns of Latium, separate songs or comic stories, recited with gesticulation and dancing to the accompaniment of a tibia, more varied in their occcasions and subjects than the Fescenninae. They belonged to the popular festivities, and when in the year 390 (A. V. C.) a public stage was erected at Rome, they were also enacted on it by wandering mountebanks. Later on, when regular dramas in the Greek fashion were established among the public entertainments, they were joined to them and thus gradually came to be looked upon as farces or after-plays, exodia, though this place was afterwards occupied by the Atellanae.

1. With regard to the saturae all is obscure and uncertain. Something may be gathered from the expression saturas agere (Liv. VII 2, 7: impletas modis saturas descripto iam ad tibicinem cantu motuque congruenti peragebant), the adaptation to the stage and so passing into the sense of exodia; see Liv. l. l. 11: iuventus histrionibus fabellarum actu relicto ipsa inter se more antiquo ridicula intexta versibus iactitare coepit; quae exodia postea appellata . . sunt.

2. Derivation of the name. Diomed. III p. 483 P. = 485 sq. K.: satira dicta sive a Satyris, quod similiter in hoc carmine ridiculae res pudendaeque dicuntur, quae velut a Satyris proferuntur et fiunt; sive satura a lance, quae referta variis multisque primitiis in sacro apud priscos dis inferebatur . . .; sive a quodam genere farciminis, quod multis rebus refertum saturam dicit Varro vocitatum. The second of these derivations was long preferred, the name being explained now of the variety of the contents, now of the mixture of singing, dancing, mimus and words; though the special mention of variety leads us to suppose the existence of uniform rules, a point which applies only to the later kind of literary Satire. Mommsen, R. Hist. I² p. 28. 206. 430, has revived the first derivation in a modified form. According to him, satura is "the

masque of the full men," (σάτυροι, saturi, cf. Tibull. II 1, 23 saturi . . coloni) "the song enacted at a popular carnival". If so, what substantive accounts for the feminine form of the word? Is it to be res? But comp. also the Italian farsa (prop. stuffing, mixture) and the Arabic kind of poetry Quasside (orig. the full, the satisfied, H. Ewald Gött. Gel. Anz. 1861 p. 833).

3. A wooden stage in the Circus was erected for performances to amuse the people (by mimi, see § 7) in the year 390 = 364 B. C., Liv. VII 2. Fest. p. 326, a.: scenicos (ludos) primum fecisse C. (Ati-?)lium, M. Popilium M. f. (Cos. 395 A. V. C.) (curules) aediles memoriae (prodiderunt) historici. Mommsen I². p. 340: "The new stage . . was, indeed, originally intended for players and mountebanks of all kinds, among whom the dancers to the accompaniment of the flute, especially the Etruscans, who then enjoyed a great reputation, may have been the most prominent"; but a starting-point was thus given for a regular theatre such as was commenced by Andronicus 120 years later. After the introduction of a regular book for the play, adopted from the Greek, the old songs to a tibia may have still been used for filling up the intervals, while the farcical performances, in like manner as the Greek Satyr-drama, were added after the serious performances which were in accordance with the rules of art.

4. Exodium denotes a merry farce acted after a serious play; cf. Plut. Crass. 33: *εἰς τοιοῦτό φασιν ἐξόδιον τὴν Κράσσου στρατηγίαν, ὥσπερ τραγῳδίαν, τελευτῆσαι.* Comp. Pelopid. 34: *τὴν ταφὴν οἷον τραγῳδίας μεγάλης, τῆς τυραννίδος ἐξόδιον θεατρικὸν γενομένην.* Schol. Iuv. III 175: exodiarius apud veteres in fine ludorum intrabat, quia ridiculus foret, ut quidquid lacrimarum atque tristitiae conlegissent ex tragicis affectibus huius spectaculi risus detergeret. After the disappearance of the old saturae, the Atellanae and mimi were especially used for this purpose; hence Atellanicum exodium (Suet. Tib. 45), exodium Atellanae (Iuv. VI 71) and Lyd. de mag. I 40: *Ἀτελλάνη ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν λεγομένων ἐξοδιαρίων.* Erroneously Livy VII 2, 11: quae exodia postea appellata consertaque fabellis potissimum Atellanis sunt.

7. The mimus being a farcical representation on the stage of persons and actions, is in all probability at Rome of about the same age as the stage itself. Originally these mimi may have been acted on the stage by themselves, but when performances of a serious nature had gained the ascendency, they were employed as after-plays, though for a long time they were less popular than the newly accepted Atellanic farces; until in Cicero's time the Mimus also obtained a place in literature and then maintained itself on the stage all the longer, at first as an after-play, but also in the Imperial period by itself.

Diomed. III p. 488 P. = 491, 13 sqq. K.: mimus est sermonis cuiuslibet motus (sermonem movere, like iocum movere in Sall. Cat. 25) sine

reverentia, vel factorum et (etiam) turpium cum lascivia imitatio; a Graecis ita definitus: *μῖμός ἐστι μίμησις βίου τὰ τε συγκεχωρημένα καὶ ἀσυγχώρητα περιέχων.* In the same manner Euanthius states that the mimi were named so ab diuturna imitatione vilium rerum et levium personarum, and Isid. Or. XVIII 49: mimi sunt dicti graeca appellatione quod rerum humanarum sint imitationes. Plutarch, Quaest. sympos. VII 8, 4, distinguishes two kinds of *μῖμοι, ὧν τοὺς μὲν ὑποθέσεις, τοὺς δὲ παίγνια καλοῦσιν,* both unfit for exhibition during dinner, the first *διὰ τὰ μήκη τῶν δραμάτων καὶ τὸ δυσχορήγητον,* and the *παίγνια* on account of their obscene character, although he adds that they did form a favourite amusement at dinner, even in the presence of women and boys. In the latter sense we find it e. g. in Polyb. XXXI 4: *ὑπὲ τῶν μίμων ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰσεφέρετο . . ὡς εἷς ὢν τῶν μίμων. καὶ τῆς συμφωνίας προκαλουμένης ἀναπηδήσας ὠρχεῖτο καὶ ὑπεκρίνετο μετὰ τῶν γελωτοποιῶν.* Literary history deals only with the first kind of mimus which bears a scenic character; as to the second kind, i. e. the *μῖμοι* as farcical representations in private circles, which belongs to the department of a the history of morals, see esp. O. Jahn's Prolegg. to his edition of Persius, p. LXXXIV—XCII. On the mimus of the Romans in general see Ziegler, de mimis Roman. Göttingen 1788, and espec. C. I. Grysar's essay on the Roman Mimus, Vienna 1854 = Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad., philosophisch-hist. Cl. XII. p. 237—283, with the addenda p. 283—337, where, however, the different periods are not sufficiently separated. On later mimi see also E. Munck, de fab. Atell. p. 124 sqq. Krahner, Ztschr. für Alt. Wiss. 1852 p. 390 sqq. L. Friedländer, History of Roman manners. II², p. 298 sqq.

2. The mimus was "a very old creation of the people, and the productions of Laberius and Syrus differ no less from its original form than the literary form given to the Atellanae by Pomponius and Novius differs from their primitive form." J. Vahlen, Ztschr. für östr. Gymn. 1859. p. 291. In fact the mimus suited the Italian character (§. 3 sq.) and the culture of the Romans. As long as its character was not fixed in writing, not being strictly separated from the mountebank representations in every-day life, it was left unnoticed. The traces of its existence in the time before Sulla have, however, been collected by M. Hertz, in the jahrb. edited by Fleckeisen XCIII. p. 581—583. The oldest trace occurs in Festus p. 326 M., where the writer, after mentioning the erection of a stage and the introdution of performances on it, thus proceeds: solebant (his prodire mimi) in orchestra (?), dum (in scena actus fa-)bulae componeren(tur, cum gestibus ob-)scaenis. Then follows a mention of ludi (Apollinares) Sulpicio C. Fulvio cos. (rather P. Sulp. Cn. Fulvio = 243 A. V. C., 211 B. C.) at which appeared a libertinus mimus magno natu qui ad tibicinem saltaret, and of the deviating opinion of Sinnius Capito, who placed the event Claudio et Fulvio cos. (542 = 212). See F. Osann, Festus and the first performance of mimi at Rome, Jahn's Jahrb. LXXIII. p. 660—663. In the seventh century are mentioned excesses of the mimi by nominatim compellare in scena (Cornif. ad Her. I 14, 24. II 13, 19) and in the year 639 Cassiodorus states that the

censors artem ludicram ex urbe removerunt. To the same period belongs the mimus vetus oppido ridiculus called Tutor, in Cic. de or. II 64, 259 (663 A. V. C.) Val. Max. II, 10, 8 notices the nudatio mimarum on the stage at the Floralia as a priscus mos iocorum. In like manner, the ἀρχιμῖμος Σώριξ (Plut. Sull. 36) in the time of Sulla justifies conclusions as to an old organization of this class. It is possible that before the general acceptance of the name of mimus the same institution existed under the name of planipes, comp. Grysar p. 245 sq.

3. Diomed. III p. 487 P. = 490, 3 sqq. K.: quarta species (fabularum latinarum) est planipedis, qui graece dicitur μῖμος. Ideo autem latine planipes dictus quod actores pedibus planis, i. e. nudis, proscenium introirent, non ut tragici actores cum cothurnis neque ut comici cum soccis ... cuius planipedis Atta .. ita meminit: daturin estis aurum? exsultat planipes. Festus p. 277 in.: mimi planipedes. Auson. ep. 11: de mimo planipedem. Juv. VIII 191: planipedes audit (populus) Fabios (comp. Suet. Ner. 4. Tac. Hist. III 62). Donat. de com.: planipedia autem dicta ob humilitatem argumenti eius ac vilitatem actorum, qui .. utuntur in scena .. plano pede. Gell. I 11, 10: si ut planipedi saltanti .. numeros et modos .. tibicen incineret. Macrob. Sat. II 12: planipedis et fabulonis (sannionis?) impudica .. verba iacientis. The identity of planipes and mimus may, therefore, be considered certain.

4. Cic. ad Fam. IX 16, 7: secundum Oenomaum Attii non, ut olim solebat, Atellanam, sed, ut nunc fit, mimum introduxisti. Comp. embolium (Cic. p. Sest. 54, 116) and emboliaria (Plin. N. H. VII 47, 158) in Sulla's time, and for the Imperial period Orelli 2513, also emboliarius (Garucci, graffiti d. Pompei p. 14). It may, perhaps, be concluded from Donatus' definition of siparium that later on mimi were sometimes used as after-plays: siparium, mimicum velum quod populo obsistit dum fabularum actus commutantur. Comp. Sen. tranq. 1, 8: Publilius .. inter multa alia cothurno, non tantum sipario, fortiora et hoc ait. Juv. VIII 185 sq.: vocem .. locasti sipario, clamosum ageres ut Phasma Catulli. See also Sueton. Dom. 10: occidit et Helvidium filium, quasi scenico exodio (probably a mimus) sub persona Paridis et Oenones divortium suum cum uxore taxasset.

8. At the end of the republic the mimus was introduced into literature by D. Laberius, Publilius Syrus and perhaps Valerius. At the same time the number of its subjects was enlarged, and its form was assimilated to that of the other kinds of drama. Under the Emperors, when the Mimus prevailed in company with the silent pantomimus, books were written by Philistion, Catullus and Lentulus, besides whom we hear also of Hostilius, Marullus, Atticus, Vergilius Romanus, Aemilius Severianus and Aesopus. Our information about the character of the mimi of this period enables us to draw conclusions as to the original character of the whole

species, in making allowance for the over-refined character of a later time, and keeping in mind that after the absorption of all other kinds of drama in the mimus, a more varied action was developed in it and it arrived at greater independence.

1. Athen. VI. p. 261 C.: *Νικόλαος* (of Damasc.) .. *Σύλλαν φησὶν .. οὕτω χαίρειν μίμοις καὶ γελωτοποιοῖς, φιλόγελων γενόμενον, ὡς καὶ πολλὰ γῆς μέτρα αὐτοῖς χαρίζεσθαι τῆς δημοσίας. ἐμφανίζουσι δ' αὐτοῦ τὸ περὶ ταῦτα ἱλαρὸν αἱ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γραφεῖσαι σατυρικαὶ κωμῳδίαι τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ*, a passage explained of mimi by Grysar p. 287. Cf. Plut. Sull. 3 and 36. It is certain that in Caesar's time Laberius and Publilius Syrus wrote mimi, the latter of whom united in his person the characters of a writer and actor of mimi. In the Augustan time L. Crassicius, genere Tarentinus, .. initio circa scenam versatus est, dum mimographos adiuvat (Suet. gramm. 18.) It is doubtful if the senarii attributed by Seneca (Ep. 8, 9) to his Lucilius are from a mimus. For Atticus see Martial II 7, 3: componis belle mimos. Of Vergilius Romanus Pliny says Ep. VI 21, 4: scripsit mimiambos tenuiter, argute, venuste atque in hoc genere eloquentissime. Tertull. apolog. 15: dispicite Lentulorum et Hostiliorum venustates, utrum mimos an deos vestros in iocis et strophis rideatis. For Aesopus see Amm. Marc. XXX 4, 21; Aemilius Severianus (of Tarraco) mimographus, Orelli 2622. Subjects were adopted to pantomimes in the Imperial period by Arbronius Silo (Sen. suas. II 19, p. 17, 9 Bu.: pantomimis fabulas scripsit), Lucan (fabulae salticae XIV, Vacca), Statius (Juv. VII 87).

2. Cic. de or. II 59, 242: mimorum est ethicorum si nimia est imitatio (caricatures), sicut obscenitas. Cf. ib. 239. orat. 26, 88: ridiculo sic usurum oratorem ut .. nec subobsceno (utatur), ne mimicum (sit). Ovid Trist. II 497 (obscena iocantes) and 515 (imitantes turpia). Quintil. VI 1, 47. — The principal purpose was to provoke laughter: Hor. I 10, 6 sq. Apulei. Flor. I: si mimus est riseris, si comoedia faveris. Cassiod. Var. IV fin.: mimus, qui nunc tantummodo derisui habetur. Lyd. mag. I 40: *μιμικὴ ἡ νῦν ὑφ' ἑν μόνη σωζομένη, τεχνικὸν μὲν ἔχουσα οὐδὲν λόγῳ, μόνον τὸ πλῆθος ἐπάγουσα γέλωτι.* This was also done by means of making faces (Quintil. VI 3, 9), imitating the sounds of animals etc. — Plan and general scheme. Cic. Phil. II 27, 65: persona de mimo, modo egens repente dives. p. Cael. 27, 65: mimi est iam exitus, non fabulae: in quo cum clausula non invenitur fugit aliquis ex manibus, deinde scabilla concrepant, aulaeum tollitur. Later on, greater accuracy was used: Quintil. IV 2, 53: est quidam etiam ductus rei credibilis, qualis in comoediis etiam et in mimis. — Plut. de solert. anim. 19 (of the time of Vespasianus): *μίμῳ πλοκὴν ἔχοντι δραματικὴν καὶ πολυπρόσωπον.* — Specimens of a dialogue in Cic. de or. II 67, 274, e. g.: quid est tibi Ista mulier? „Uxor". Similis, me dius fidius. — Laberius' prologue in Macrob. Sat. II 7, 2 sq. Cf. Isid. Orig. XVIII 49: habebant (mimi) suum actorem qui antequam mimum ageret fabulam pronuntiaret. On the cantica, see below n. 7.

3. Being a scurrilous representation of low life, the mimus is to a certain extent like the togata and both have many titles in common, e. g. Aquae caldae, Augur, Compitalia, Fullo, Virgo, the latter two occurring also among the Atellanae, with which the mimus shares also the titles Gemini, Hetaera, Nuptiae, Piscator. The principal difference may be found in the prevalence of the mimic element in the mimus, and the existence of the oscae personae in the Atellanae. With the palliata the mimus shares the titles Colax, Hetaera, and Phasma, and besides we find the following originally Greek titles of mimi: Alexandrea, Belonistria, Cophinus, Ephebus, Necyomantia, and Scylax. The plots were in general of an obscene character, esp. seductions, scenes of adultery, cheating of husbands or fathers or persons easily imposed upon. See Ovid. Trist. II 497 sqq. Cic. p. Rab. Post. 12, 35: illim omnes praestigiae, .. omnes fallaciae, omnia denique ab iis mimorum argumenta nata sunt. Juv. VII 44. VIII 197. Capitol. M. Anton. 29, 2. Lamprid. Heliog. 25, 4 (mimica adulteria). Donatus on Aen. V 64: mimi solis inhonestis et adulteris placent. Lactant. inst. VI 20: (mimi) docent adulteria dum fingunt. Minuc. Fel. Oct. 37, 12: mimus vel exponit adulteria vel monstrat. Grysar p. 253. With the same tendency mythological subjects were selected and treated, especially frequently under the Emperors (by Laberius: Lacus Avernus, Necyomantia.). Arnob. ad gent. IV 35: etiam mimis et scurrilibus ludicris sanctissimorum personae interponuntur deorum, et ut spectatoribus vacuis risus possit atque hilaritas excitari iocularibus feriuntur cavillationibus numina. Ib. VII 33: symplegmatibus plurimis intermixtos se esse derisionis in materiam norunt (dii). Tertull. apolog. 25: dispicite .. utrum mimos an deos vestros .. rideatis, moechum Anubim et masculam Lunam, Dianam flagellatam et Iovis mortui testamentum recitatum et tres Hercules famelicos irrisos. Similar subjects are Kinyras and Myrrha (Joseph. Ant. XIX 1, 13), Paris and Oenone (Suet. Dom. 10), Priapus (Augustin civ. dei VI 7). So in the pantomimes of Leda (Juv. VI 63. Arnob. adv. g. VII 33) and others (Apulej. apol. 74 extr. Arnob. I 1.) In this way, the mimi were both a symptom and an important vehicle of the most horrible immorality.

4. This scurrility and corruption are seemingly contrasted (Sen. Ep. 8, 8 sq.) by the wise and moral sentences with which especially Syrus' mimi abounded, perhaps owing to the influence of Greek comedy (comp. Plaut. Rud. IV 7, 23 sqq.) But this combination of scurrility and wisdom is quite in keeping with the popular character (see W. Hertzberg on Juvenal XV, 16. p. 336 sq.), and in the Imperial period the second feature may have been less conspicuous. On the other hand, personal allusions which had been made in the mimi even before (Cornificius above 7, 2. Laberius v. 2). were then sometimes indulged in by the mimi against the very highest persons. Capit. M. Ant. 8, 1: adepti imperium ita civiliter se ambo egerunt ut .. eos Marullus, sui temporis mimographus, cavillando impune perstringeret. Ib. 29, 1 sq. (ter — Tullus). Maximin. 9, 3 sqq. Lamprid. Comm. 3, 4 (appellatus est a mimis quasi obstupratus). Comp. Vopisc. Aurel. 42, 5.

5. The mimi were performed by one principal actor. Publilius cum mimos componeret ingentique assensu in Italiae oppidis agere coepisset (Macrob. S. II 7, 7). Laureolum ... Lentulus egit (Juv. VIII 187). Doctus archimimus .. cotidie in Capitolio mimum agebat (Augustin. civ. d. VI 10). Besides these there were also actores secundarum inferior to the first (Hor. Ep. I 18, 13), who imitated him throughout (Suet. l. l.) and received blows from him (Juv. V 171. VIII 192. Martial. II 72, 3 sq. V 61, 11 sq. Arnob. adv. g. VII 33). Among these we find in a prominent place the customary part of the stupidus (Orelli 2645 in Verona: Aurelius Eutyches, stupidus greg(is) urb(anae), comp. ib. 2608. Juv. VIII 197); he appeared capite raso (Heinrich on Juv. V 171 p. 219 sq. Non. Marc. p. 6, 25; calvitur = frustratur, tractum a calvis mimis, quod sint omnibus frustratui, Arnob. l. l.: delectantur dii stupidorum capitibus rasis, salpittarum sonitu ac plausu, factis et dictis turpibus, fascinorum ingentium rubore). Festus s. v. salva res, erroneously bringing in the palliata: secundarum partium fuit, qui fere omnibus mimis parasitus inducitur. With the same inaccuracy Hieronym. ep. ad Eustoch. 22: virgines .. quae rubore frontis parasitos vincunt mimorum. One of the peculiarities of the mimi and a principal source of dissoluteness was the representation of the female parts by women, some of which mimae attained to a certain kind of celebrity, e. g. Arbuscula, Dionysia, Cytheris, Origo, Quintilia, Bassille (C. I. Gr. III. p. 1013): Claudia Hermione, archimima, Orelli 4760; Arete archimima, Gruter p. 330, 4. — In the Imperial period we find no longer the number of performers restricted to certain limits: cf. Petron. Sat. 80: grex agit in scena mimum, pater ille vocatur, filius hic, nomen divitis (comp. Sen. Ep. 114, 6: in mimo divites fugitivi) ille tenet. Plut. de sol. an. 19: *μίμῳ πλοκὴν ἔχοντι .. πολυπρόσωπον*. The Laureolus e. g. required a great number of performers (Jos. Antiq. XIX 1, 13). The performance of a trained dog is mentioned by Plutarch l. l.

6. The costume of the mimi was a many-coloured harlequin's jacket, centunculus (Apulej. apol. 13) without calcei (excalceati, Sen. Ep. 8, 8), whence the name planipedes above 7, 3. In keeping with their character the mimae were gaily dressed leaving the person almost nude: peculiar to them seems to have been the recinium or ricinium. Festus p. 274—276: recinium .. esse dixerunt vir(ilis) toga(e simile vestimentum quo) mulieres utebantur, praetextum clavo purpureo, unde reciniati mimi planipedes. Comp. Varro L. L. V 132: antiquissimis amictui ricinium. Non. Marc. p. 542: ricinum .. palliolum femineum breve. Serv. Aen. I 282: togas etiam feminas habuisse cycladum et recini (Var. ricini) usus ostendit. Masks were excluded by the mimic element. With respect to the estimation in which the mimi were held, see e. g. Vopisc. Carin. 16, 7: mimis, meretricibus, pantomimis, cantoribus atque lenonibus Palatium implevit. Comp. Trebell. Gallien. 21, 6. Trig. tyr. 9, 1 etc.

7. The diction of the mimi was in accordance with the subjects and the taste of the audience, i. e. plebeian: as to Laberius, see Gellius XVI 7. In the fragments we find iambic senarii and trochaic tetrameters. Comp. Laberius v. 55: versorum, non numerum, nu-

mero studuimus. The mimiambics of Matius were, however, in choliambic metre. But considering the action of the mimi (e. g. the alapae) it appears scarcely credible that all mimi at all times were in metre; sometimes this may, therefore, have been limited to the cantica. The existence of these cantica appears from *μιμῳδοί*, Plut. Sull. 2. The obscena cantica with which omne convivium strepit (Quintil. I 2, 8) may be assumed to have occurred in mimi. Versus cantare in Capitol. Maximin. 9, 5. So also salva res est dum cantat senex, Fest. p. 326. The acompaniment of a tibia belonged especially to saltatio; Fest. p. 276: ad tibicinem saltare; Gell. I 21, 12: si ut planipedi saltanti .. numeros et modos .. tibicen incineret. Quintil. I 10, 31: non hanc (musicen) a me praecipi quae nunc in scenis effeminata et impudicis modis fracta non ex parte minima si quid in nobis virilis roboris manebat excidit. The close connexion with the pantomimi is shown, e. g., by Macrob. Sat. II 7, 13: cum canticum quoddam saltaret Hylas (a pantomime) cuius clausula erat *τὸν μέγαν Ἀγαμέμνονα*; comp. Apulej. apol. 74 extr.: saltandis fabulis exossis plane et enervis, sed, ut audio, indocta et rudi mollitia. negatur enim quidquam histrionis (a general expression) habuisse praeter impudicitiam. It appears, therefore, that cantica were not wanting in the pantomimes, though the performer himself did not sing them, they being recited behind the stage.

8. On the medieval mimi see Grysar p. 331—337 and Krahner, Ztschr. f. Alt. Wiss. 1852 p. 388 sq.; the last pagan priests were at the same time the last mimi and joculatores (see e. g. the description of a person of this kind in a sermon by Maximus Taurinensis, Muratori Anecd. IV p. 99), and the earliest notices with regard to incipient medieval dramas represent them as ecclesiastical with the same joculatores in the service of dramatic art.

9. The Atellanae (fabulae A.) are so called from Atella, a small town in Campania, in a country originally Oscan. Atellan plays originally denoted comic descriptions of the life in small towns, in which the principal persons gradually assumed a fixed character. After the Romans (A. v. c. 543) had annihilated the independence of Campania, and latinized the province, both the thing and its name migrated to Rome, and soon Maccus, Bucco, Pappus and Dossenus were well-known and favourite figures with the Roman people also, who joined to them similar ones, such as Manducus, Mania, Lamia, Pytho. The youth of Rome most probably liked the new performances as an improved kind of saturae, and they themselves played in them masked. Only the general plot was then arranged, the rest being left to improvisation. The scheme of the plays was all the simpler. Their form may be presumed to have been, in most cases, a simple dialogue, songs in Saturnian metre being perhaps interspersed; the jokes were coarse, accom-

panied by lively gesticulation, which was also obscene; the Latin diction bore a plebeian character.

1. Literature: C.E. Schober, on the Atellan plays. Leipzig 1825, and de Atellanis exodiis, Breslau 1830. F. Weyer, on the At., Mannheim 1826. Zell, Writ. during Vacation-time, II p. 139 sqq. Klenze, philol. writings, (Berlin 1839) p. 91—105. E. Munck, de fabulis Atellanis (with a collection of the fragments), Breslau 1840. Th. Keller, de lingua et exodiis Atellanarum, Bonn 1850. Lannoy, Essai sur les Atellanes et sur quelques productions du théâtre populaire dans l'ancienne Rome, in the Mém. de la société littéraire de Louvain, V (1850) p. 85—1830. Mommsen, R. H. II². p. 438—442. W. Teuffel in Pauly's R. E. I 2. p. 1957—1960.

2. Diomedes III p. 487 P. = 490,1 sq.: tertia species est fabularum latinarum quae a civitate Oscorum Atella, in qua primum coeptae (a mistake) appellatae sunt Atellanae, argumentis dictisque iocularibus. Mommsen, l. l., considers the Atellan plays as originally Latin and the Oscan country (latinized since 543) as their poetical scene only. This would be at variance with their great antiquity as well as with the general designation of the Atellanae as osci ludi (Cic. Fam. VII 1, 3), oscum ludicrum (Tac. A. IV 14), the principal persons as oscae figurae (Diomed. III p. 488 P. = 490, 20 K.)

3. Maccus is stupid, voracious and wanton, has asses' ears etc. Bucco amuses by his bucca, in blabbing and devouring. Pappus is an old man, vain, and very stupid, always cheated by wife and son. Dossennus (dorsum) is a cunning sharper, the dottore.

4. Livy VIII 2, 12: quod genus ludorum (At.) ab Oscis acceptum tenuit iuventus nec ab histrionibus pollui passa est. eo institutum manet ut actores Atellanarum nec tribu moveantur et stipendia tamquam expertes artis ludicrae faciant. Hence in his peculiar manner Val. Max. II 4, 4, p. 71, 12 sqq. Halm. Fest. v. personata, p. 217 a. M.: per Atellanos qui proprie vocantur personati, quia ius est iis non cogi in scena ponere personam, quod ceteris histrionibus pati necesse est. When a. 639 the censors artem ludicram ex urbe removerunt, they made an exception only as to latinum tibicinem et ludum atellanum (so M. Hertz instead of talanum of the mss.) Cassiod. ad a. (p. 620 in Mommsen.)

5. Varro Gerontodidascalo: putas eos non citius tricas Atellanas quam id extricaturos? Non. p. 8, 29. Comp. Tertull. spect. 17: Atellanus gesticulator. Quintil. I. O. VI 3, 47: amphibolia, neque illa obscura (? obscena) quae Atellani e more captant.

6. Incorrectly Strabo V 3, 6. p. 233 C.: *τῶν Ὀσκων ἐκλελοιπότων ἡ διάλεκτος μένει παρὰ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις, ὥστε καὶ ποιήματα σκηνοβατεῖσθαι κατά τινα ἀγῶνα πάτριον καὶ μιμολογεῖσθαι.* The Oscan language was not understood at Rome, comp. Liv. X 20, 8. Titin. v. 104. Gell. N. A. XVII 17, 1. Macrob. Sat. VI 4, 23. Perhaps the rustic language in the Atellanae (Varro L. L. VII 84. 96) appeared so strange to Strabo that he thought it was a different dialect, a mistake perhaps also facilitated by the name osci ludi.

10. In the time of Sulla the Atellan plays, which previously had only been popular farces, received literary treatment at the hands of Pomponius of Bononia and Novius, they being the first to write complete texts of their plays. By means of a well-laid plot, consistent characters and metrical form, the Atellan plays were then raised to the same level with the other kinds of comedy, only they preserved more the character of burlesques. Besides the description of popular life and the personal allusions, we now find also mythological titles. Henceforth the Atellan plays were used as after-plays, and performed by professional actors. Even under the first Emperors these plays were still in vogue and cultivated by Mummius, but owing to the character of the period their voice was gradually silenced and they were merged in the pantomimes.

1. As to Pomponius and Novius see below § 125. — Cic. Fam. IX 16, 7 (written a. 708): secundum Oenomaum Accii non, ut olim solebat, Atellanam, sed, ut nunc fit, mimum introduxisti. Comp. Mar. Vict. p. 2527 P. and above § 7, 4. In small country-towns Atellan plays were occasionally performed by themselves, Juv. III 171.

2. Suet. Nero 39: Datus Atellanarum histrio in cantico quodam etc.; comp. Gall. 13: Atellanis notissimum canticum exorsis. Juv. VI 71 sq.: Urbicus exodio risum movet Atellanae gestibus Autonoes. Orelli 5682 (from Pompeii): Mete Cominiaes Atellana. Tac. A. IV 14: Caesar (Tiberius) de immodestia histrionum rettulit . . oscum quondam ludicrum, levissimae apud volgum oblectationis, eo flagitiorum et virium venisse ut auctoritate patrum coercendum sit. Comp. Suet. Tib. 35 extr. Calig. 27 extr.: Atellanae poetam (perhaps Mummius?) ob ambigui ioci versiculum media amphitheatri arena igni cremavit. — Macrob. Sat. I 10, 3: Mummius, qui post Novium et Pomponium diu iacentem artem Atellaniam suscitavit. — Spartian. Hadr. 26, 4: in convivio tragoedias, comoedias, Atellanas . . semper exhibuit (Hadrian). Tertull. de spectac. 17. Arnob. adv. gent. VII 33. Concerning the relation of the Atellan plays to the mimi, see above 8, 3. Comp. L. Friedländer, History of Roman manners II³. p. 297 sq.

11. Under the head of the popular poetry of the Romans may be classed all they possessed in a metrical form (i. e. in the Saturnian metre) before the introduction of art-poetry i. e. before Andronicus and the year 514. Some productions handed down from later and literary periods belong to an older time, both in tendency and character. In the Imperial period we meet especially with lampoons and similar occasional pieces with a tendency to accented rhythm and indifferent

treatment of hiatus. This accounts for the fact of the early Christian hymns, intended as they were for the use and understanding of the people, being composed in the same manner

1. A list of poetical productions in the time before Andronicus, will be found below §. 51 sqq.

2. In the literary period we may assume an earlier origin for the following: 1) popular love-songs, one of which is alluded to by Hor. S. I 5, 15 sq. But the serenades in Plaut. Curc. I 2, 60 sqq. (in cretic metre), Hor. Od. III 10 and Ovid Amor. I 6 are not popular. — 2) nursery-songs: see Schol. Pers. III 16: quae infantibus, ut dormiant, solent dicere saepe: lalla lalla, lalla, aut dormi aut lacte, (instead of which we should probably read latta); hence lallare Pers. III 16: and Auson. epist. XVI 90 sq.: nutricis inter lemmata Lallique somniferos modos. [But see L. Müller, Rh. Mus. XXIV p. 620 who shows that the nursery-song in question was only lalla, lalla, lalla etc. ad infin.: the true reading in the Schol. is lalla, i. e. aut dormi aut laeta.] — 3) Songs used in the games of boys, Hor. Ep. I 1, 59 sq. and II 3, 417 (with the Schol.), from which L. Müller (Fleck. jahrb. 89 p. 484) shows that the lines should most probably be arranged as follows: hábeat scabiem quísquis ad me vénerit novíssimus. Rex erit qui récte faciet; quí non faciet, nón erit. To this class belongs also Málum consilium cónsultori [semper ipsi]st péssimum. Though it cannot be denied that sentences of this kind might also pass into popular usage and become proverbial from being originally part of a literary composition, e. g. Syrus' mimi. — 4) Lampoons on belated husbándmen (Hor. S. I 7, 28 sqq. comp. with Auson. Mosell. 166: navita labens .. probra canit seris cultoribus), on misers (Plaut. Trin. 350 sqq. R.: cívi immuni scín quid cantarí solet? "Quód habet ne habeás et illuc quod nón habes habeás malum, Quándoquidem nec tíbi bene esse póte pati neque álteri." On the other hand, the prescription for gulones in Macrob. S. VII 12, 9 is shown by its contents and expression to be of later origin: múlsum quod probe témperes Míscendumst novo Hyméttio Ét vetulo Falérno.

3. In the popular effusions of the Imperial period we also find a predilection for the trochaic tetrameter, which is indeed suited to the character of the Latin language. In this metre we have the lampoons in Suet. Caes. 80 (comp. 49. 51), Schol. Juv. V 3. Comp. Suet. Calig. 6. Vopisc. Aurel. 6, 5. 7, 2. Lampoons of higher pretensions and produced in cultivated circles have the form of epigrams: Suet. Oct. 70. Tib. 59. Cal. 8. Ner. 39. Dom 14. 23. Comp. Schol. Hor. S. I 7, 20. An epigrammatarius appears in Vopisc. Florian. 16, 3. See G. H. Bernstein, versus ludicri in Rom. Caesares priores olim compositi, Halle 1810. Zell, Writings in Vacation-time, II p. 165—169. The expression of which Festus p. 285 M. says "retiario adversus mirmillonem pugnanti cantatur" is usually considered to be in Sotadic metre, but may also be in Saturnian metre: Non té petó, piscém petó: quíd me fúgis, Gálle? Of hymns comp. Díes irae, díes illa etc. Ápparebit répentina Dies

magna dómini etc. Soon also rhyme was adopted, e. g. in the two Roman songs of the sixth century quoted by Gregorovius, Hist. of the City of Rome I p. 472 sq.

4. Zell, Writings in Vacation-time, II p. 97 sqq. Edelestand du Méril, poésies populaires latines, antérieures au douzième siècle, Paris 1844. W. Teuffel, Pauly's R. E. VI 2. p. 2736—2738. Westphal, on Greek metres (Leipzig 1865) p. 270 sqq.

12. The regular drama was the first of the various kinds of art-poetry imported at Rome at the beginning of the sixth century and was soon diligently cultivated both in its serious and its comic side, with more or less originality. But the entertaining kinds prevailed greatly, the palliata, Rhinthonica, togata, including the trabeata and tabernaria, the mimus (with planipedia or riciniata), to which the Atellan plays in their later form may be added. Of serious plays we have besides tragedy only the praetexta to name.

1. Donat. de com.: Fabula generale nomen est: eius duae primae partes sunt tragoedia et comoedia. Caesius Bassus de metr. p. 2672 P. enumerates tragoedia, praetextata, comoedia, tabernaria, Atellana, Rhinthonica, mimi. Donatus l. l.: comoediarum formae sunt tres: palliatae, graecum habitum referentes, togatae, iuxta formam personarum habitum togarum desiderantes . . Atellanae etc. and: comoedia multas species habet: aut enim palliata est aut togata aut tabernaria aut Atellana aut mimus aut Rhinthonica aut planipedia. (Euanth.) de trag. et com.: illud vero tenendum est post *νέαν κωμῳδίαν* Latinos multa fabularum genera protulisse, ut togatas, scenicis atque argumentis latinis; praetextatas . .; Atellanas, . .; Rhinthonicas, ab auctoris nomine; tabernarias, ab humilitate argumenti et stili; mimos, ab diuturna imitatione vilium rerum et levium personarum. Lyd. de magg. I 40: *ἡ κωμῳδία τέμνεται εἰς ἑπτά, εἰς παλλιάταν, τογάταν, Ἀτελλάνην, ταβερναρίαν, Ῥινθωνικήν, πλανιπεδαρίαν καὶ μιμικήν.*

2. Valuable notices on the various kinds (though mixed with errors) are found in Diomedes, ars gramm. III p. 484—489 P. = 487—492 Keil, and in the treatise de tragoedia et comoedia, the first half of which most probably belongs to Euanthius, the second half having been edited by Westerhoff as fragmentum Donati (de comoedia), the whole also printed in Zeune's edition of Terence I p. XXV—XXXIV.

13. In tragedy the Romans were throughout dependent upon the Greeks. It is true that there were points in the character, the institutions and history of the Romans which would have been favourable to the creation of an independent tragic literature; but the poetical power necessary for

shaping these subjects was not possessed by them, least of all when tragedies were first presented to them. They were translations from the Greek, of rude execution in the case of Andronicus, but steadily improved and made more original by Naevius, Ennius, Pacuvius and Attius. All these tragic writers of the republican time possessed great gravity in their characters, sentiments and style, though they fell occasionally into bombast or triviality, and made their verses somewhat awkwardly. The same may be assumed of the tragedies of Atilius, C. Titius, C. Julius Caesar, Strabo, Varro, Q. Cicero, Cassius of Parma, Asinius Pollio, though the last of them seems to have been original in his subjects. The formal refinement of the Augustan period extended also to tragedy, and no doubt appeared just as much in L. Varius' Thyestes and Ovid's Medea as in Turranius, Gracchus, Mam. Scaurus, Pomponius Secundus and in the tragedies of Seneca. But the greater the attention paid to form and style, the less did the poets aspire to popular effect, and phraseology continued more and more to be cultivated. Among the later tragic writers only Curiatius Maternus is of any importance.

1. The old collections of the fragments of these poets (the last by Bothe in his Poetae scenici latini) are antiquated. Tragicorum latinorum reliquiae, recensuit O. Ribbeck. Lips. 1852 (with quaestiones scenicae and verbal index.) [a new edition preparing]

2. T. Baden, de causis neglectae a Romanis tragoediae, Gött. 1789. H. Planck, proll. to his edition of Ennius' Medea (Gött. 1807. 4°.) p. 9—66. G. Köpke, Why are the Romans unequal to the Greeks in tragedy? in Seebode's Neues Archiv 1826 p. 146—161 and before his translation of Plautus. A. G. Lange, Vindiciae tragoediae rom., Lips. 1822. 4°. and in his Miscellaneous Writings (Leipzig 1832) p. 15 sqq. W. Regel, virorum doctorum de re tragica Rom. iudicia etc. Gött. 1834. 4°. and res tragica Rom. retractata, Lüneburg 1845. 4°. Th. Ladewig, Analecta Scenica, Neustrelitz 1848. 4°. But above all F. G. Welcker, The Greek tragedies etc. (Suppl. II 3 to the Rhen. Mus. Bonn 1841. p. 1332—1484.) On the tragedies of the Imperial period see also L. Friedländer, History of Roman manners II². p. 308—314.

3. The number of tragic poets known to us by more or less explicit mention amounts at the utmost to 36, that of their plays to about 150 (see Ribbeck p. 435—439); but only Seneca's plays are in existence. A general criticism in Quintil. X 1, 79: tragoediae scriptores veterum Attius atque Pacuvius clarissimi gravitate sententiarum, verborum pondere, auctoritate personarum. Ceterum nitor et summa in excolendis operibus manus magis videri potest temporibus quam ipsis

defuisse. ... (98.) Iam Varii Thyestes cuilibet Graecorum comparari [?] potest. Ovidii Medea videtur mihi ostendere quantum ille vir praestare potuerit si ingenio suo imperare quam indulgere maluisset. Eorum quos viderim longe princeps [?] Pomponius Secundus.

4. Tragedy also consisted of portions of sedate and of more excited character, of dialogue and of lyric parts which were sung—diverbium and cantica. Comp. Donat. de trag. et comoed.: diverbia histriones pronuntiabant, cantica vere temperabantur modis non a poeta, sed a perito artis musicae factis. The dialogue was principally in iambic trimeters, admitting however, in the Republican period, of spondees (and so also anapœsts and dactyls) in all places, and was only treated with more purity after the time of Augustus. The cantica show little variety in their metres, anapœsts and cretics being the most frequent, besides which we have also trochaic and iambic tetrameters, and dactylic lines. They were accompanied by a tibia (Cic. orat. 55, 184. de or. I 60, 245. Tusc. I 44, 107. Hor. Ep. II 3, 215) and habitués were skilled enough to know the piece about to be performed from the prelude of the tibicen (Cic. Acad. pr. II 7, 20, comp. de or. III 50, 196). In Cicero's time the eminent actor Aesopus brought tragedies (espec. those of Pacuvius and Attius) very much into vogue: see e. g. Cic. p. Sest. 56. Fin. V 22, 63. Tusc. I 44, 106. Lael. 7, 24. Other tragoediarum actores are Rupilius (Cic. off. I 31, 114), Catienus and Fufius (Hor. S. II 3, 60 sq.), Apelles (Suet. Calig. 33), Glyco (Pers. V 9), Apollinaris (Suet. Vesp. 19). Even Seneca observes the rule of the 3 actors and must therefore be assumed to have written his tragedies for actual performances, as has been shown by Weil, Revue archéol. 1864. I p. 21—36.

5. A chorus in the Greek manner was impossible for the Romans for the simple reason of the Senate occupying the orchestra. Choric dancing being thus excluded, we find now and then a number of performers simultaneously on the stage (the pulpitum of which was wider for this reason, Vitruv. V 5) and singing together (catervae atque concentus, Cic. de or. III 50, 196; comp. Columella XII 3). In the ancient Roman tragedians a certain imitation of the choric songs is not improbable, because they were mere translators; this is supported by such titles as Bacchae, Eumenides (comp. Cic. p. Rosc. Am. 21, 66 sq. in Pison. 20, 46), Hellenes, Myrmidones, Phinidae, Phoenissae, Stasiastae, Troades, as well as by numerous details. The account of Lucullus, e. g., in Hor. Ep. I 6, 40 sqq. (comp. Plut. Lucull. 39: *στρατηγοῦ ποτε φιλοτιμουμένου περὶ θέας καὶ χορῷ τινι κόσμον αἰτουμένου πορφυρᾶς χλαμύδας*) presupposes a chorus. In Andronicus' Ino the chorus sung hymnum Triviae (Ter. Maur. 1934), in Naevius' Lycurgus we find a chorus of bacchanals, in Ennius' Iphigenia (Gell. XIX 10, 12) and Medea (fr. 14 = Eur. Med. 1251 sqq.) there are choruses; in Pacuvius is a stasimum (Mar. Vict. p. 2522 P.), and in Antiopa, Chryses, Niptra there are also parts resembling a chorus. A 'chorus Proserpinae' is mentioned by Varro L. L. VI 74. Traces of choruses are more scarce in Attius, though evident in the Bacchae and Philocteta. Pomponius

Secundus (Ter. Maur. 1965 sqq. 2135 sqq. Mar. Vict. p. 2564 P.) and Seneca would not, it may be supposed, have composed choric songs without the example of the ancient poets. See in general Grysar, On canticum and chorus in the Roman tragedies, Vienna 1855 = Trans. of the Acad. at Vienna XV p. 365—423 (the canticum p. 367—383; the tragic chorus p. 384—403; the citharoedi and cantores tragoediarum in the Imperial period, p. 403—423.)

14. The (fabula) praetexta is the Roman tragedy of a national character; in the absence of indigenous heroic legends, historic subjects were adopted and, as a rule, by poets who also wrote tragedies on Greek subjects and after Greek originals. Thus Naevius (Clastidium, Romulus), Ennius (Ambracia, Sabinae?) Pacuvius (Paullus), Attius (Aeneadae, s. Decius; Brutus) Curiatius Maternus (Cato, Domitius Nero?). Balbus wrote also Iter ad Lentulum, Persius a Restio (?), an unknown poet (Cassius?), Marcellus. The tragedy of Octavia claims to be a praetexta. In form and character these plays were made after tragic models, but their style is in agreement with the subjects, being less sublime.

1. The form 'praetexta' is used by Asinius Pollio (in Cic. Fam. X 32, 3, 5), Horace (Ep. II 3, 288), Probus (vita Persii p. 237 Jahn), Festus (p. 223, comp. p. 352 a. M.); the designation 'praetextata' prevails in the later grammarians.

2. Diomedes p. 487 P. = 489, 25 sqq. K.: prima species est togatarum (national dramas), quae praetextatae dicuntur, in quibus imperatorum negotia agebantur et publica et reges romani vel duces inducuntur, personarum dignitate et sublimitate tragoediis similes. praetextatae autem dicuntur quia fere regum vel magistatuum qui praetexta utuntur in eiusmodi fabulis acta comprehenduntur. (Comp. praetextati in magistratibus, in sacerdotiis, Liv. XXXIV 7. Also Non. Marc. p. 541: praetexta, insigne romanorum, quod supra tunicas honorati quique sumunt.) Donatus de comoedia: tragoedia, si latina argumentatio sit, praetextata dicitur. Euanth. de trag. et com.: praetextatas, ab dignitate personarum et latina historia. Lydus de magg. I 40: *ἡ τραγῳδία τέμνεται εἰς χρηπιδάταν καὶ πραιτεξτάταν· ὧν ἡ μὲν χρηπιδάτα ἑλληνικὰς ἔχει ὑποθέσεις, ἡ δὲ πραιτεξτάτα ῥωμαϊκάς.* Hence Tac. dial. 2, though inaccurately, designates Curiatius Maternus' Cato as tragoedia. Sen. Ep. I 8, 8 means praetextae in speaking of togatae: see below 17, 1.

3. The fragments are collected by J. H. Neukirch, fab. tog. p. 71—95, and Ribbeck, trag. p. 235—240, see ibid. p. 348—351. F. G. Welcker, the Greek tragedies (1841) p. 1344—1347. 1388 sqq. 1402 sq.

15. The earliest of the different kinds of comedy (§ 12) is the palliata, on Greek subjects and imitated from Greek

originals, especially the New Attic Comedy. Its period extends over the whole sixth century v. C. To this belong Andronicus, Naevius, Plautus, Ennius, Trabea, Atilius, Licinius Imbrex, Juventius, Statius Caecilius, Luscius Lanuvinus, Terence, Plautius, Turpilius: a series of names on one hand representing a scale of increasing refinement in style, but on the other hand also of decreasing originality with regard to the treatment of the Greek originals. The first composers of palliatae endeavoured to assimilate their pieces to the popular taste by various additions of a local or temporal character or by making them more coarse; the later ones, Terence e. g., despised attractions of this kind, but in so doing lost the popular sympathies which were turned to the more amusing style of the togatae, Atellanae and mimi. The consequence was that the production of new palliatae ceased, and if plays of this class were wanted, the stage had to fall back upon older literature. The plays of Plautus and Terence subsisted on the stage after the establishment of the Empire. The original productions during this latter period, e. g. by Vergilius Romanus and M. Pomponius Bassulus, were confined to small circles and remained without effect.

1. Diomed. III p. 486 sq. P. = 489, 18 K.: graecas fabulas ab habitu palliatas Varro ait nominari. Comp. Plaut. Curc. II 3, 9: isti Graeci palliati etc. Pallium graecanicum (Suet. Dom. 4) = ἱμάτιον ἑλληνικόν (Lucian merc. cond. 25). The palliata was also briefly styled comoedia and the poets belonging to it comici. Comp. Ritschl, Parerga p. 189. Hence Diomed. III p. 488 P. = 490, 14 sqq. K.: togata tabernaria a comoedia differt, quod in comoedia graeci ritus inducuntur personaeque graecae . ., in illa vero latinae . . Terentius et. Caecilius comoedias scripserunt. In this way Quintil. XI 3, 178 mentions Demetrius and Stratocles as maximos actores comoediarum, the following description and 182 showing that palliatae are understood. So also Fronto Ep. p. 54 and 211 N. (comoedias, Atellanas). 106 (sententias comes ex comoediis) etc.

2. The old Attic Comedy was too much connected with its own period to be fit for imitation by another nation and in a different period; but the middle Comedy is merely a transitional stage. On the other hand, the New Comedy was the nearest in time, in the sixth century v. C. held the stage, and was by its typical delineation of character and general human bearing especially fitted to be transplanted to foreign soil. In it we notice especially Menander, besides also Diphilus and Philemon. Others are mentioned by Gell. II 23, 1: comoedias lectitamus nostrorum poetarum sumptas et versas de Graecis, Menandro aut Posidippo aut Apollodoro aut Alexide et quibusdam item aliis comicis. — Bugge, causas nonnullas neglectae apud Romanos comoediae Graecorum veteris et mediae ex ipsa civitatis romanae forma eruere conatus

est, Christiania 1823. On the dying out of the pall. in the Imperial period M. Aurel. comm. XI 6: ἡ νέα κωμῳδία πρὸς τί ποτε παρείληπται ἢ κατ' ὀλίγον ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκ μιμήσεως ψιλοτεχνίαν ὑπερρύη; a mere exercise of the pen was the experiment of Sardinus, ingeniosus adolescens (in the Augustan period), a quo graecae fabulae eleganter in sermonem latinum conversae sunt (Sen. suas. VII 12 p. 43 sq. Bu.). Comoedias audio in Plin. Ep. V 3, 2 should be understood of recitation (as in the case of Vergilius Romanus).

3. The fragments of the written palliatae (except Plautus and Terence) besides Bothe's Poetae scenici lat. especially in O. Ribbeck Comicorum latinorum . . . reliquiae. (Lips. 1855) p. 3—112. A curious classification of the poets of palliatae (Caecilius Statius, Plautus, Naevius, Licinius, Atilius, Terentius, Turpilius, Trabea, Luscius, Ennius) by Volcatius Sedigitus, see in Gellius XV 24. Th. Ladewig, on the canon of Volc. Sed. Neustrelitz 1842. 4° vainly endeavours to produce rational grounds for it: see Ritschl in Reifferscheid's Suetonius p. 501 sq. H. Iber de Volcati Sedigiti canone, Münster, 1865. 48 pp. 8°.

16. From the New Comedy the palliata took not only its plots, characters, arrangements and outward form, but also its spirit of surfeited life and moral nihilism, and in this way contributed not a little to the depravation of Roman morals. The prologue, epilogue and perhaps also the division into acts are especially derived from the Attic originals. The palliata having no more a chorus than the New Comedy, each piece is divided into portions of dialogue (diverbia) and monodies (cantica). In the first the poets of the palliatae curtailed, for their audiences, the loquacity of their originals, especially by means of the so-called 'contamination,' being moreover less limited in the number of their performers than their originals. The dialogue is generally in iambic senarii; in the cantica we have, besides septenarii, a frequent use of cretics and bacchics, the latter proportinately strict, the prosody of the senarii with numerous and large concessions to the popular pronunciation. The recitation of the cantica was accompanied by a tibia. The performers were masked not until after the time of Terence.

1. On the relation of the palliata to the New Comedy see espec. Mommsen H. of Rome I² p. 883—885 and W. Hertzberg's introd. to his translation of Plautine plays (Stuttgart 1866) p. IX—XXXII. The characters in both are miserly fathers, spendthrift sons, cunning slaves, greedy and amorous girls, coarse and boastful soldiers, starved parasites, all of them symptoms of a decaying civilisation, with no vitality in it to save it. Isidor. Orig. XVIII 46: comoedi sunt qui pri-

vatorum hominum acta dictis ac gestu canebant atque stupra virginum et amores meretricum in suis fabulis exprimebant.

2. Euanth. de tr. et com.: comoediae aut motoriae sunt aut stataria aut mixtae. motoriae (sunt) turbulentae, stataria quietiores, mixtae ex utroque actu consistentes. According to this the Plautine plays are nearly all motoriae, the Terentian mixtae, Phormio is a motoria, Hautontim. a stataria (Haut. prol. 36). In agreement with this the actors (Donat. ad Ter. Ad. prol. 24 and Quintil. XI 3, 178) and then also the orators (Cic. Brut. 20, 116. 68, 239) were divided into statarii and motorii.

3. Diomedes III p. 489 P. = 491, 29 sq. K.: latinae comoediae chorum non habent, sed duobus membris tantum constant, diverbio et cantico. primis autem temporibus, sicuti adserit Tranquillus, omnia quae in scena versantur in comoedia agebantur. nam et pantomimus et pythaules et choraules in comoedia canebant (the pantomimus perhaps after the separation of singing and acting: see Liv. VII 2, 10: inde ad manum cantari histrionibus coeptum diverbiaque tantum ipsorum voci relicta.) Gradually, he states, the histriones (actores comoediarum) were separated from the mimi and tibicines. Id. p. 491, 23 sqq. K.: personae diverbiorum aut duae aut tres aut raro quattuor esse debent, ultra augere numerum non licet. in canticis autem una tantum debet esse persona aut, si duae fuerint, ita esse debent ut ex occulto una audiat, nec conloquatur, sed secum .. verba faciat. Three actors were most probably the normal number in the palliatae too: for a later period this is established by Martial VI 6: comoedi tres sunt, sed amat tua Paula, Luperce, quattuor: et κωφὸν Paula πρόσωπον amat. The Republican ediles were, however, less mindful of economy than the Athenian choregi and allowed the poets even more actors, and thus of the Plautine plays only two (Cist. and Stich., though both incomplete) may perhaps be managed with three actors, while eight require at least 4, and ten at least 5 performers; of the Terentian plays two require 4, two 5, and two even 6 performers. Not even in the limited sense in which Horace (Ep. II 3, 192) warns against scenes with more than 3 speakers, did the poets of the palliatae confine themselves; comp. e. g. Ter. Phorm. III 2. IV 3 and Diomed. III p. 488 = 491, 2 sq. K.: at latini scriptores complures personas in fabulas introduxerunt, ut speciosiores frequentia facerent. Ascon. on Cic. Div. in Caec. 15: latinae fabulae (togatae and others) per pauciores agebantur personas (than the palliatae).

4. G. Hermann, de canticis in Rom. fabb. scenicis, Opus. I p. 290 sqq. G. A. B. Wolff, de canticis etc. Halle 1824. 4°. Grysar (see above 13, 5). There are, however, also comedies without cantica, e. g. Plautus' Miles glor., Persa, perhaps also Epidicus. Traces of 'synodic' cantica, i. e. set for several voices, appear espec. at the end of the Captivi; comp. also ib. II 1. Musical accompaniment tibiis paribus aut imparibus aut sarranis, on which e. g. Diomed. p. 492, 10 sqq. K. Don. de com. s. f., praef. Eun. and Adelph. where we read: modulata est tibiis dextris, i. e. Lydiis, ob seriam gravitatem, qua fere in omnibus comoediis utitur hic poeta

(i. e. Terence) saepe tamen mutatis per scenam modis cantica mutavit, quod significat titulus scenae, habens subiectas personis litteras M. M. C. (mutatis modis cantici). Sinistris (or Sarranis) in a higher pitch and therefore for less serious parts. The expression tibiae pares is generally explained 'with nothing but either dextrae or sinistrae' (impares = dextrae or sinistrae), though we should then also expect a notice, whether dextrae or sinistrae. See K. Dziatzko, Rhen. Mus. XX p. 594—597, and comp. Grysar l. l. p. 376—378.

5. In the old Attic Comedy and perhaps also the Middle one the intervals were marked and filled up by choric songs, in the New One most probably by the *αὐλητής*. Only in the last the division into acts can have been customary, nor does Aristotle say anything on this point. Their theory seems to have been invented by the Alexandrines. It is assumed in Cic. ad Qu. fr. I 16, 46: ut hic tertius annus imperii tui tamquam tertius actus perfectissimus atque ornatissimus fuisse videatur (comp. Apul. Flor. 16, 64 p. 132 Bip.: cum iam in tertio actu, quod genus in comoedia fieri amat, iucundiores affectus moveret), even more explicitly in Horace's rule (Ep. II 3, 189): neu sit quinto productior actu fabula. But the original MSS. of Plautus and Terence cannot yet have contained any division into acts and scenes. This appears from Donatus' repeated complaints about the difficulty of this division (comp. Euanth. de tr. et com.: postremo ne locum quidem reliquerunt choro quod latini fecerunt comici, unde apud illos dirimere actus quinquepartitos difficile est) and from the frequent want of regularity, if not the inaccuracy of the traditional division. In general see Don. arg. Andr.: est attente animadvertendum, ubi et quando scena vacua sit ab omnibus personis, ut in ea chorus (in tragedy) vel tibicen (in comedy) audiri possit; quod quom viderimus, ibi actum esse finitum debemus agnoscere. Five acts are set down as the highest number in Donatus' rule (ib.): nullam personam egressam quinquies ultra exire posse. They are generally so arranged that the first contains the explanation of the plot (*πρότασις*), while the knot is entangled in acts II to IV (*ἐπίτασις*), when the dénouement is given in the fifth (*καταστροφή*). Comp. G. A. B. Wolff, de actibus apud Plautum et Terentium, Guben 1814. 4°. Ritschl, Rhen. Mus. IV p. 597 sqq. K. F. Hermann, de Ter. Adelphis (Jahn's Jahrb. Suppl. VI p. 71 sqq.) G. Schmitz, de actuum in Plautinis fabulis descriptione, Bonn 1852.

6. The prologues commonly contained a summary of the subject of the play (Ter. Andr. prol. 5 sqq.), but like the parabasis of the Old Comedy, were also used for the explanation of the poet's personal requests. Euanth. de tr. et com. distinguishes 4 kinds: *συστατικός*, commendaticius; *ἀναφορικός*, relativus; *ὑποθετικός*, argumentarius; *μικτός*, mixtus. The prologue was recited without any theatrical costume (sine ornamentis Plaut. Poen. prol. 123 = ornatu prologi Ter. Hec. prol. B 1) by an actor who did not appear in the first act (change of dress, Poen. prol. 126; exceptions in Ritschl Parerg. p. 19) or by the dominus gregis (so several times in Terence). But it does not

always precede the first act (Plaut. Mil. Gl. II 1. Cist. I 3; comp. Don. praef. to Ter. Phorm. s. f.) and may even be omitted altogether (Plaut. Curc.) For the new performances of a play, even after the poet's death, new prologues used to be composed, and those prefixed to the Plautine plays are mostly of this kind, see Ritschl, Parerga p. 209 sqq. 225 sqq. 233 sqq. and below § 88.

7. The customary form of the epilogue is plaudite. Comp. Menand. fr. 831: ἐξάραντες ἐπιχροτήσατε with Plaut. Truc. fin.: plaudite atque exsurgite. See also Quintil. VI 1, 52: illud quo veteres tragoediae comoediaeque cluduntur, Plodite. Hor. Ep. II 3, 155 etc.

8. Naevius already, Plautus, Ennius, and Terence following them (Andr. prol. 17 sqq.) as a compensation for their curtailing of the originals and in order to increase the attraction of a play, transferred single scenes of a Greek play of similar plot, into the one adapted by them, a proceeding called contaminare by Luscius: see Andr. prol. 16. Haut. prol. sqq. On the other hand the πρόσωπα προτατικά serve especially to facilitate the exposition, see Don. arg. Andr.: persona protatica intelligitur quae semel inducta in principio fabulae in nullis deinceps fabulae partibus adhibetur. (Euanth.) de trag. et com.: προτατικὰ πρόσωπα, i. e. personas extra argumentum arcessitas, non facile ceteri habent (though Plautus has Artotrogus in the Miles); quibus Terentius saepe (in the Andria and Eun.) utitur, ut per harum inductiones facile pateat argumentum.

9. On Masks. Diomed. III p. 486 P. = 489, 10 sqq. K.: antea galearibus, non personis, utebantur, ut qualitas coloris indicium faceret aetatis, cum essent aut albi (old men) aut nigri (young men) aut rufi (slaves). personis vero uti primus coepit Roscius Gallus, praecipuus histrio, quod oculis perversis erat nec satis decorus sine personis nisi parasitus pronuntiabat. But Don. de comoed.: personati primi egisse dicuntur comoediam Cincius Faliscus, tragoediam Minucius Prothymus, the latter also performer in the Adelphi. Add to this Don. praef. to Ter. Ad.: haec acta est.. agentibus L. Ambivio et L..., qui cum suis gregibus iam tum personati agebant. But the Phormio e. g. was acted without masks, as is shown by I 4, 32 sqq. = 210–212. After their introduction masks appear to have remained the rule; this would seem to result from such passages as Cic. de or. III 59, 221: in ore sunt omnia... personatum ne Roscium quidem magnopere laudabant (nostri senes), as well as from cogi in scena ponere personam, quod ceteris histrionibus (besides the Atellani) pati necesse est (Fest. p. 217 M.); we also find that since then the actores comoediarum (as distinguished from the mimi = artifices scenici, Sen. Ep. I 21, 7) are only recommended for their recitation and acting (Quintil. III 8, 51. XI 3, 178). Of such actores com. we know only one in Plautus' time, (C. Publilius) Pollio (Ritschl, Parerga p. 250. 256. 261 sq. 392); in Terence's time through Donatus and the scenic notes, besides those already mentioned, esp. (L.) Ambivius Turpio, L. Atilius of Praeneste; in Quintilian's time Stratocles and Demetrius (I. O. XI 3, 178).

17. Togatae in a wide sense is the name given to all plays not imitated from the Greek, but of Italian origin, whether the braided (praetexta and trabeata) or the simple toga was the costume of the performers. In a more limited acceptation togata denotes that kind of national drama in which the performers appeared in a simple toga, togati. Later on, the name tabernaria became more usual to denote this. This togata represents the life of the lower classes in Rome, thus possessing a tone more coarse than the palliata, but also greater freshness and real life. But it surpasses more especially the palliata in the idea of domesticity, the female sex being far more prominent in it, and the slaves holding comparatively insignificant parts. The chronology of the togata is defined on the one hand by the over-refined palliata of Terence, and on the other by the artificial Atellana and the mimus. Its principal poets are Titinius, Quintius Atta and L. Afranius, all between 585 and 675 v. c. Afranius raised the togata into higher circles of society, introduced the arrangement and tone of the palliata into it, sometimes even used Greek plays for his purposes, and in this way created a kind of mixed species, which, however, died out with him. Even in the Imperial period Afranius' togatae were performed, though with an admixture of pantomimic art, to suit the taste of the period.

1. Among the togatae in the broadest sense of the word (as a nomen generale) Diomedes III. p. 486 sq. P. = 489 sq. K. enumerates: a) praetextatae, b) togatae = tabernariae, c) Atellanae, d) planipedes, and defines them: quae scriptae sunt secundum ritus et habitum hominum togatorum, i. e. Romanorum. In this sense togata comprises also the trabeata which Diomedes omits, though this was merely a transient and unimportant species, devoted especially to the knights whose peculiar habit was the trabea (Pers. III 29. Dio LVI 31), and a species merely due to Maecenas' freedman, C. Melissus; Suet. de gramm. 21 extr. (p. 116 Rffsch.): fecit (Mel.) et novum genus togatarum inscripsitque trabeatas. In the same general sense, and especially of praetextae, Sen. Ep. I 8, 8 uses the term togatae; non attingam tragicas nec togatas nostras. habent enim hae quoque aliquid severitatis et sunt inter comoedias ac tragoedias mediae.

2. Diomed. III p. 487 P. = 489, 28 sqq. K.: secunda species est togatarum quae tabernariae dicuntur et humilitate personarum et argumentorum similitudine comoediis (= palliatis) pares, in quibus .. humiles homines et privatae domus inducuntur, quae quidem olim, quod tabulis tegerentur, communiter tabernae vocabantur. But there are privatae domus in the palliatae as well, and tabernae are rather the booths of tradespeople

and shopkeepers.. Festus v. togatarum (p. 352 a. M.) enumerates among the characters of the tabernariae besides others also plagiarii, servi denique, in general such as ex tabernis honeste prodeant. Comp. also such titles of togatae as Augur, Cinerarius, Fullonia, Libertus, Psaltria, Tibicina. Togatae is the namen given to plays of this kind espec. by Cic. p. Sest. 55, 118. Hor. Ep. II 3, 288. Vellej. II 9, 3. Sen. Ep. XIV 1 (= 89), 7 (comp. Afranius v. 299). Suet. Ner. 11. Quintil. X 1, 100. Gell. X 11, 8. XIII 8, 3.

3. The p ots of the togatae are generally laid at Rome, though not unfrequently also in a provincial town in order to ridicule either the life of a small town or satirize Rome in a disguised manner, or to describe the impression produced by Rome on a man from the country; comp. the titles Brundisinae, Ferentinatis, Setina, Veliterna, Ulubrana. From the mere titles appears the large admixture of the female sex (even of virgins), and this is still more shown by the fragments. Comp. also Serv. Aen. XI 160: in togatis victrices appellantur quae viros extulerunt. Donatus, on Ter. Eun. 12, is very significant: concessum est in palliata poetis comicis servos dominis sapientiores fingere, quod item in togata non fere licet.

4. Diomed. p. 488 P. = 490, 16 K.: togatas tabernarias in scenam dataverunt praecipue duo, L. Afranius et G. Quintius. Acro on Hor. Ep. II 3, 288 is confused: praetextas et togatas scripserunt Aelius Lamia, Antonius Rufus, Gn. Melissus, Afranius, Pomponius. A togatarius (histrio) Stephanio (cui in puerilem habitum circumtonsam matronam ministrasse compererat Augustus and whom he therefore per trina theatra virgis caesum relegavit) occurs in Suet. Aug. 45; comp. Plin. N. H. VII 49: minus miror Stephanionem, qui primus togatas saltare instituit, utrisque saecularibus ludis saltasse, et D. Augusti et quos Claudius Caesar consulatu suo quarto fecit, quando LXIII non amplius anni interfuere, quamquam et postea diu vixit. A performance of Afranius' Incendium under Nero is mentioned by Suet. Ner. 11.

5. In imitation of the arrangement of the palliata Afranius has prologues (v. 25—30. Macrob. Sat. VI 5, 6: Afranium .. qui in prologo ex persona Priapi ait, just as in his Sella Sophia appeared as a speaker) and cantica (even synodic ones). Cic. p. Sest. 55, 118: cum ageretur togata Simulans, ut opinor — caterva tota clarissima concentione .. contionata est. The adoption of the parasites belongs to the same features, though the roman clientship and the scurrae offered analogies.

6. The fragments of togatae are collected by Bothe and also by J. H. Neukirch, de fabula togata (Lips. 1833) p. 96—280, and in Ribbeck's Com. lat. p. 115—188. On the togata see also Ladewig in Pauly's Real-Enc. VI 2. p. 2024 sq. and Mommsen R. H. I³. p. 885 sq. II³. p. 438.

18. The Romans admitted also the Rhinthonica, so-called from the Phlyacographer Rhinthon of Tarentum, who travestied tragic subjects by burlesque treatment. This species is also

called *ἱλαροτραγῳδία* and *Ἰταλική*. Its representation in the extant literature is doubtful. Atellanae with mythogical subjects seem the most similar to it.

1. The admission of the Rhinthonica at Rome appears from its being mentioned among the various kinds of Roman comedies: see § 12, 1. On Rhinthon see espec. Suidas s. v. (II p. 614 sq. Bernh.): *Ῥίνθων, Ταραντῖνος κωμικός, ἀρχηγὸς τῆς καλουμένης ἱλαροτραγῳδίας, ἥ ἐστι φλυακογραφία. υἱὸς δὲ ἦν κεραμέως καὶ γέγονεν ἐπὶ τοῦ πρώτου Πτολεμαίου* (323—285 B. Chr. = 431—469 v. c.): *δράματα δὲ αὐτοῦ κωμικὰ τραγικὰ λή*. Steph. Byz. s. v. *Τάρας: ἀνεγράφησαν πολλοὶ . . καὶ Ῥίνθων Ταρακτῖνος φλύαξ, τὰ τραγικὰ μεταρρυθμίζων εἰς γελοῖον*. Athen. IX p. 402 B.: *εἷς δ' ἐστὶν οὗτος (Σκληρίας) τῆς Ἰταλικῆς καλουμένης κωμῳδίας ποιητής, γένος Ταραντῖνος*. Lyd. de mag. I 40: *Ῥινθωνικὴ (ἐστὶν) ἡ ἐξωτική*, where Welcker's correction *ἐξοδική*, though approved by Vahlen, Rh. Mus. XVI p. 474, is not supported by the preceding *ἀτελλάνη δέ ἐστιν ἡ τῶν λεγομένων ἐξοδιαρίων*; comp. rather Plautus Men. II 1, 11 = 236 R.: Graeciamque exoticam of the South of Italy (magna Graecia).

2. The *κωμῳδοτραγῳδία* of Alcaeus, Dinolochus and Anaxandrides (Meineke hist. crit. com. gr. p. 347 sq.) is older than the *ἱλαροτραγῳδία* with its *ἀρχηγὸς* Rhinthon and cannot, therefore, be identical with it. Perhaps *κωμῳδοτρ.* was more in the style of comedies (maybe like Plautus' Amphitr. which is in the prol. 59 and 63 styled tragicocomoedia), and *ἱλαροτρ.* more like a burlesque or Atellana. tragicocomoedia also in Lutat. ad Stat. Theb. V 160.

3. The Plautine Amphitruo is most certainly no Rhinthonica, see Vahlen Rh. Mus. XVI p. 472 sqq., who suspects that rather Atellanae with mythological plots are Rhinthonicae, farcical parodies of mythico-tragical subjects.

4. Bernhardy on Suidas II p. 614 sq. Neukirch, de fab. tog. p. 15—18. E. Munck, de fabb. Atell. p. 84—89. Vahlen, Rh. Mus. XVI p. 472—476.

19. The Romans possessed a tendency to preserve and cherish the recollection of past events and as they perceived that metre facilitated both recollection and tradition, we find here a field favorable to the development of epic poetry. Hence we have at an early age ancestral songs and inscriptions of various kinds somewhat like the epic in style. The Saturnian measure employed in them was also used by the ancient epic poets in Roman literature, Andronicus and Naevius, the first a mere translator in his latin Odyssey, the latter in his bellum punicum boldly plunging into the life of his nation and time. Like him, his successor Ennius chose, in his Annals,

a national subject, which he expanded to a complete Roman history until his own time and treated in dactylic hexameters, the Greek epic measure. His example became the type for later poets, both as to subject-matter and form. During the next century no other poet attempted an epic poem; but then Hostius, plainly following Ennius, wrote a bellum istricum, and similarly L. Attius and A. Furius, Annals. Cicero himself wrote poems in hexameters on his consulship and exile (de suo consulatu, de temporibus meis). In the Augustan period Anser eulogised M. Antony, and others treated subjects of the history of the period in the manner of the Alexandrine poets and partly with panegyric tendencies, as L. Varius (de morte, sc. Caesaris; Panegyricus Augusti), Tibullus (Panegyric on Messala), Octavianus himself (Sicilia), Cornelius Severus (bellum siculum), Rabirius (bellum actiacum), Pedo Albinovanus (de navigatione Germanici per oceanum septentrionalem). In the Imperial period epic poetry was chiefly devoted to the glorious past of Roman liberty: Lucan's Pharsalia, the epic poem de bello civili in Petronius Sat. 119, and Silius Italicus' Punica; whenever contemporary history furnished the subject, the whole necessarily breathed the courtier (so Gordianus' Antoninias; Claudianus' numerous epic panegyrics and bellum Gildonicum and geticum; Sidonius Apollinaris; Corippus).

1. The interest of the subject-matter remained always predominant and decisive. Cic. de imp. Pomp. 9, 25: sinite hoc loco, sicut poetae solent qui res romanas scribunt, praeterire me nostram calamitatem. The Roman magnates longed to be glorified in poetry: e. g. Cic. p. Arch. 10, 26. 11, 27. Augustus systematically favoured and promoted epic compositions, and to abstain from them almost required an excuse, as in the case of Horace. A large number of real or pretended epic poets enumerated by Ovid ex Ponto IV 16. In the time of Nero epic composition was fashionable, see Persius I 69 sqq. Comp. Petron. Sat. 118. Martial. IV 14. Stat. silv. II 7, 48 sqq.

2. F. Winkelmann, the epic poets of Rome until the time of Virgil, Jahn's Archiv II p. 558 sqq.

20. A heroic epic was impossible at Rome in its original state, the Italian gods being mere abstractions, and godlike heroes unknown to the people. When, therefore, towards the end of the Republic the influence of the Alexandrine poets caused this class of epic poetry to be cultivated, it was necessary to choose foreign subjects. So Catullus (Epithalamium Pelei et Thetidos), Helvius Cinna (Smyrna), Licinius Calvus

(Io), Terentius Varro (Argonautica), Pedo (Theseis), as well as in respect of its subject-matter Ovid's Metamorphoses, later on the Culex and Ciris, and Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica. Others translated the Iliad, e. g. C. Matius and (Ninnius?) Crassus, at a later time Gaurus and, for scholastic purposes, the so-called Pindarus Thebanus; aspirants of a higher order reverted to the Epic Cycle, as the Cyprian Iliad (by Laevius?), Furius Bibaculus translated the Aethiopis, Aemilius Macer Antehomerica and Posthomerica, Julus Antonius Diomedea, Domitius Marsus Amazonis, Camerinus Excidium Troiae, and in later time Nero's Troica, Lucan's Iliaca, Statius' Thebais and Achilleis etc. Between the historic or national and the Alexandrine or mythological classes stands Virgil's Aeneid, in which an indigenous legend is told in a historic and psychological manner, and this became the pattern of poetical composition to the subsequent poets. After the victory of Christianity subjects taken from the biblical history of the Old or the New Testament replaced Roman history and Greek Mythology, and in the place of panegyrics on Emperors or Roman nobles we get panegyrics on Christian saints; but the treatment always adhered to the path first pointed out by Virgil. Thus we have in the first century Juvencus, Damasus and Paulinus, in the fifth Sedulius, Dracontius and Arator, in the sixth Alcimus Avitus and Venantius Fortunatus. Outside the pale of Christianity, Claudian composed his mythological epics Raptus Proserpinae and Gigantomachia. Even the latest offshoot of Roman epic poetry, the tragoedia Orestis (in hexameters), in numerous passages reminds the reader of Virgil.

1. Style of description, e. g. Sen. Apoc. 2, 3: omnes poetae, non contenti ortus et occasus describere (like Julius Montanus, Sen. Ep. 121, 29—13) etiam medium diem inquietant. A pathetic style was required: heroici carminis sonus, Tac. dial. 10. The style of the heroic epic was also transferred to the historic class, as in Silius; comp. Petron. Sat. 118: non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt, quod longe melius historici faciunt, sed per ambages deorumque ministeria et fabulosum sententiarum tormentum praecipitandus est liber spiritus, ut potius furentis animi vaticinatio appareat quam religiosae orationis sub testibus fides.

2. The general custom is already deserted in the Troiae halosis in iambic senarii in Petron. Sat. 39. In the same measure Avienus later on wrote a paraphrasis of Livy's history, and Marianus translated Apollonius' Argonautica and Nicander's Theriaca.

21. Didactic poetry being in keeping with the sober mind of the Romans was taken up at an early period. The precepts of a peasant to his son are very ancient, and Appius Claudius as well as Cato wrote in a similar spirit. The subjects of Ennius' didactic poems were more varied. Lucilius' Satires likewise pursued didactic purposes and even treated of orthography. Literary history was illustrated in the didactic poems of L. Attius (Didascalica), Q. Valerius of Sora, Volcatius Sedigitus, Porcius. Varro Atacinus composed a Cosmographia. Only a few of these poems were written in the measure of Greek epic poetry which gained an ascendancy only towards the end of the Republic under the influence of Greek literature. This we have in Cicero's translation of Aratus, in Lucretius' system of Epicurean Philosophy (de rerum natura), and further on in Virgil who in his Georgics treated a well-chosen subject with warmth and perfect art. Ovid employed the elegiac metre in the playful didactic treatment of erotic subjects (Ars amandi, Remedia amoris, Medicamina faciei), and of indigenous legends (Fasti); in epic metre he treated only the mythological subject of transformations (Metamorph.). Some of Ovid's contemporaries with less taste, and in blind imitation of the Alexandrine poets, treated utterly prosaic subjects in their didactic poems. Thus Valgius Rufus wrote a didactic poem on herbs, Aemilius Macer Theriaca and Ornithogonia, Gratius Faliscus Cynegetics, another Halieutica; in the first century of the Christian era Manilius wrote Astronomica, Germanicus a new version of Aratus, Columella wrote on horticulture; the descriptive epic, entitled Aetna, of the beginning of the silver age belongs to this series, as well as in the fourth century Lactantius' Phoenix, the various works of Ausonius, especially his Mosella, Avienus' Descriptio orbis terrae and Aratea, and his Ora maritima in iambics, Palladius' didactic poem de re rustica and the Christian and dogmatic poems of Prudentius; in the fifth century Rutilius Namatianus' Itinerarium in elegiacs. In most of these works the metrical form is merely accessary to the subject-matter, but all semblance of poetry disappears in the didactic poems of grammarians for school use, such as not only the versus memoriales (largely represented in Ausonius), but especially the metrical manuals of rhetoric, metres, prosody and metrology, the carmina de figuris vel schematibus (by Marbod and unknown authors), Terentianus Maurus' metrical treatises de litteris, de

syllabis versus heroici, de metris Horatianis, the similar ones by Albinus and perhaps Caesius Bassus, the carmina de ponderibus et mensuris by Remmius Flavinus (or Favonius) etc. Similar works are the medical systems in epic metre by Serenus Samonicus and Vindicianus. The middle ages were very fertile in productions of this kind.

22. The poetical Epistle and the Fable, have also a didactic tendency. Any poem may become a poetical Epistle by being addressed to a certain person, and thus didactic poems addressed e. g. to a son are at the same time Epistles. In a limited sense poems are called so in which the direction to individuals influences the whole contents and the treatment from beginning to end. In this manner Sp. Mummius addressed, from his camp before Corinth (608 v. c.) jocular letters in verse to his friends at Rome; Lucilius also composed several of his satires in the form of letters to friends, and Catullus' poem to Allius is also an Epistle. In the Augustan period Horace dedicated several satires to Maecenas, many lyric poems to individual friends, and in his later years dealt with questions concerning practical life and literature in real Epistles in epic metre. Ovid wrote in elegiacs fictitious love-letters of mythical ladies (Heroides), and also real letters of complaint and entreaty from his exile (Tristia and ex Ponto). The satiric poets Persius and Juvenal, too, several times address individuals by name, without, however, really preserving the Epistolary style. But Ausonius' 25 Epistles are real letters in various metres and partly on jocular subjects.

1. Cic. ad Att. XIII 6, 4 (written a. 709): Mummium fuisse ad Corinthum pro certo habeo. saepe enim hic Spurius qui nuper est mortuus epistolas (by his grandfather) mihi pronuntiabat versiculis facetis ad familiaris missas a Corintho. A book or satire of Lucilius commenced in this manner: salutem versibus Lucilius quibus potest impertit, totumque hoc studiose et sedulo etc.

23. The fable in which paraenetic subjects are dressed in tales especially relating to animal-life (animal-fable), appears in Roman literature at first in the saturae of Ennius, Lucilius and Horace, but becomes an independent species in Phaedrus (in senarii) in the time of Tiberius. Under Hadrian Dositheus and a century later Titianus made prose-translations of the fables of Babrius: at a later time Symmachus seems to have

written similar works, most probably in metre, and shortly after him Avianus composed in elegiacs 42 fables on subjects taken from Babrius. The collections of fables of the so-called Romulus, the Anonymus Neveleti, Baldo and Alexander Neckam belong to the middle ages.

1. The fable of the crested lark in Ennius (in satiris . . versibus quadratis), Gell. II 19 = Vahlen's edition of Ennius p. 159—161. The fable of the sick lion (Hor. Ep. I 1, 73 ss.) appears already in Lucilius (Non. p. 303, 17 sqq.). Others in Horace, S. II 6, 79 sqq. Epp. I 7, 19 sqq. 10, 34 sqq. Allusions to fables in Horace S. II 3, 299. 5, 56. Epp. I 3, 19. 16, 45.

2. Seneca Cons. ad Polyb. 8, 17: non audeo te usque eo producere ut fabellas quoque et Aesopeos logos, intemptatum romanis ingeniis opus, solita tibi venustate conectas. Auson. Epist. 16, 74—82; apologos . . Aesopiam trimetriam quam vertit exili stilo, pedestre concinnans opus, fandi Titianus artifex. ib. 27 he praises Symmachus: quis ita ad Aesopi venustatem . . accedat?

24. Satire was introduced into literature through Ennius who gave the title of Saturae to a collection of his miscellaneous poems. This example was followed perhaps by his nephew Pacuvius, certainly by the Roman knight C. Lucilius. To criticise public circumstances (a conspicuous feature in the works of the latter), henceforth became a principal feature of Satire, since Horace, who after a few less significant successors wrote in Lucilius' manner, endowed with brilliant gifts, energetically pursued the same direction, though exclusively in social and literary life, and confining himself to hexameters. The Saturae Menippeae of the polyhistor Varro, composed in a free interchange of prose and verse, found in Nero's time imitators in Seneca (Ἀποκολοκύντωσις) and Petronius, in the fifth Christian century in Martianus Capella (though in him prose is predominant) and in the sixth in Boethius' work de consolatione philosophiae. On the other hand Horace had an imitator in the youthful Stoic Persius. Under Domitian Turnus and Sulpicia wrote satires, after his death the rhetor Juvenalis his gloomy moral lectures and portraits. A satirical spirit appears also in Apuleius' prose-novel, the Metamorphoses, and in several apologetic and polemic works of Tertullianus. In the fourth century Tetradius wrote satires, in the fifth Claudian his invectives against Rufinus and Eutropius in epic metre.

1. Diomed. III p. 481 sq. P. = 485, 30 sqq. K.: satira dicitur carmen apud Romanos nunc quidem maledicum et ad carpenda hominum vitia archaeae comoediae charactere (Quintil. X 1, 93 says more justly: satira quidem tota nostra est) compositum, quale scripserunt Lucilius et Horatius, et Persius. at olim carmen quod ex variis poematibus constabat satira vocabatur, quale scripserunt Pacuvius et Ennius. The derivation of the name from satura lanx (see above 6, 2) would fit satire as a branch of literature, even the satire of Ennius; if Ennius has connected this title with the old (dramatic) farce, he must mean it humorously, but this is not very probable, as he includes such serious poems as his Scipio.

2. Hor. S. I 10, 54 (46) sq.: hoc erat, experto frustra Varrone Atacino, atque quibusdam aliis, melius quod scribere possem. To these quidam alii most probably belonged the polyhistor Varro with his four books of Saturae, then L. Albucius (cuius Luciliano charactere sunt libelli, Varro R. R. III 2, 17), C. Trebonius (Cic. ad Fam. XII 16, 3) and the freedman Saevius Nicanor (Suet. gramm. 5) and Lenaeus (ib. 15.) — Lyd. de magistr. I 41: *μεθ' ὃν* (Lucilius) *καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτόν, οὓς καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι σατυρικούς, οἱ νεώτεροι . . τὴν σατυρικὴν ἐχράτυναν κωμῳδίαν, Ὁράτιος μὲν οὐκ ἔξω τῆς τέχνης χωρῶν, Πέρσιος δὲ τὸν ποιητὴν Σώφρονα μιμήσασθαι θέλων τὸ Δυκόφρονος παρῆλθεν ἀμαυρόν· Τοῦρνος δὲ καὶ Ἰουβενάλιος καὶ Πετρώνιος αὐτόθεν ταῖς λοιδορίαις ἐπεξελθόντες τὸν σατυρικὸν νόμον παρέτρωσαν.*

3. Quintil. X 1, 95: alterum illud etiam prius satirae genus, sed non sola carminum varietate mixtum, condidit Terentius Varro, vir Romanorum eruditissimus. The Cynic Menippus of Gadara, a pupil of the Cynic Diogenes, of the generation next to Alexander, had as a *σπουδογελοῖος* treated serious subjects in the practical parts of philosophy in a jocular tone. The decay of the sense of beauty in his time and Menippus' position as a Cynic render it probable that he had already preceded Varro in the mixture of prose and verse which in him seems sometimes to take place in the middle of a sentence: see A. Riese in Jahn's Jahrb. 95 p. 646—648. Cic. Acad. post. I 2, 8 lets Varro say: in illis veteribus nostris quae Menippum imitati, non interpretati, quadam hilaritate conspersimus multa admixta ex intima philosophia, multa dicta dialectice. Cf. Gell. II 18, 7: Menippus . ., cuius libros M. Varro in satiris aemulatus est quas alii cynicas, ipse appellat Menippeas. In the manner of Varro's satirae Menippeae are also the Emperor Julianus' *Καίσαρες*, except that they are in Greek.

4. According to Porphyr. on Hor. Ep. I 3, 1, Julius Florus, a contemporary of Horace, was saturarum scriptor cuius sunt electae ex Ennio, Lucilio, Varrone saturae. In the same period as Juvenal, Julius Rufus wrote satiras (Martial. X 99), as well as according to tradition Silius (Schol. Juv. I 20: Lucillium dicit . . vel Silium et ipsum sui temporis satyricum, qui omnes, ut Probus refert, ex Aurunca fuerunt) and Manlius Vopiscus (Stat. Silv. I 3, 103). To the third century is attributed the will of a pig, a parody of the legal forms of a will, published for the

first time by Peter Lambecius, comm. de bibl. Caes. Vindob. III p. 346 sqq., repeated by Brissonius de formulis VII p. 677 and others. In the fourth century Ausonius (Epist. 15) says of his alumnus Tetradius e. g. (9 sqq.): rudes Camenas qui Suessae praevenis aevoque cedis, non stilo: later on Rutilius Nam. of his friend Decius (Itin. I 599—606): huius vulnificis satira ludente Camenis nec Turnus potior nec Iuvenalis erit (603 sq.)

5. Is. Casaubonus de satyrica Graecorum poesi et Roman. satira, Paris 1605. Halle 1774. J. A. Vulpi, de satirae lat. natura et ratione eiusque scriptoribus, Padua 1744. G. König, de satira Rom., Oldenb. 1795. Flögel, History of Comic Literature II p. 1—57. Wernsdorf, poetae latini minores, III p. XIII—XXVI. C. L. Roth, on the theory and internal history of Roman Satire, Stuttgart, 1848. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Real-Encycl. VI 1 p. 819—822. C. Scheibe, de satirae rom. origine et progressu Zitttau 1849. 4°. H. Berning, de satirarum scriptoribus Rom., Recklingshausen 1850. 4°. Fr. Haase, on the Satire of the Romans, in Prutz's German Museum 1851 p. 858—867. J. M. Söderhelm, de vernacula Rom. satira ad ideam eius nativam adumbrata, Helsingsfors 1852. 4°. C. Petermann, on the origin and Idea of Roman Satire, Glogau 1856. 4°. Jung, de satira rom., Neisse 1862. 4°.

25. The Idyl as a species, with its feminine and tender longing for a missing ideal, was on the whole foreign to the Romans. Tibullus possesses the greatest share of idyllic spirit, after him Virgil and, in his peculiar fashion, also Horace. But on the whole the Romans were too well acquainted with country-life to idealise it. Virgil, who had grown up in the country, in his youth at first chanced upon this species and imitated Theocritus without coming up to him, even spoiling this kind of poetry by giving it an allegorical character. But the Moretum is a proof of the good humour of its author. Valerius Cato's Dirae are midway between Idyl and Satire, though more akin to the first, especially by their amoebaean composition. In the beginning of Nero's reign we have the seven Eclogues of Calpurnius Siculus, imitated by Nemesianus at the end of the third century. Perhaps to the same time belong Septimius Serenus' Opuscula ruralia and Falisca, in lyric metres, but Idyls as to their subjects. Ausonius' *Εἰδύλλια* are far from being so, a better claim to this name belongs to many parts of the Mosella, and at the end of the fourth century we have the poem de mortibus boum by the Christian rhetor Severus Sanctus Endelechius. Seven poems of Claudianus, of various character, and partly in epic, partly in elegiac metre, bear the collective title of Eidyllia.

1. Diomed. III p. 483 P. = 486, 17 K.: bucolica dicuntur poemata secundum carmen pastorale composita.

2. In Virgil's Georg. see espec. II 448 sqq. Horace (S. II 6. Ep. I 10) cherishes and praises rustic life as healthful and independent. — Macrob. Sat. III 98, 19: Suevius, vir longe doctissimus, in idyllio quod inscribitur Moretum, from which he proceeds to quote 8 hexameters very different in tone from the pseudo-Virgilian Moretum; cf. ib. VI 5, 15: Suevius in libro quinto. Ovid most probably alludes to Idyls ex Ponto IV 16, 35: (cum) Naidas a Satyris caneret Fontanus amatas. In the Augustan period M. Valerius Messala wrote in Greek Idyls of an erotic character (Ps. Verg. Catal. 11, 13—24).

3. Hunger, de poesi Rom. bucolica, Halle 1841. R. Unger, Valg. Ruf. p. 285–326. W. Teuffel in Pauly's R. E. I 2 p. 2528 sq.

26. Lyric poetry, or the poetry of the individual in its widest sense, did not greatly harmonise with the practical Roman mind, and was thus cultivated by them only late and to a limited extent. At a comparatively early time occur only those kinds which had a certain bearing upon actual life, e. g. religious songs (of the Salii, fratres arvales, the hymn of Andronicus), songs in honour of the departed, complaints, enchantments, and other things which became carmina by the employment of the Saturnian metre. Besides, the national bent for sharp criticism led at an early time to abusive ditties, such as the Fescenninae, the occentationes, the soldiers' songs on the triumphator, and probably many cantica interpersed in the popular farces. Of the literary branches the easiest, the epigram, was first cultivated, partly to serve as inscription, partly as the mere product of wit and occasion, partly also as a small erotic elegy. For the first purpose it was, after Ennius, more and more employed on sepulchres and pictures, sometimes in hexameters only (as in Plautus' epitaph), sometimes in distichs (as in the epitaph of Cn. Cornelius Scipio Hispanus, praetor (615 v. c.), most systematically in Varro's Imagines. Representatives of the other two uses of the epigram are in the first half of the seventh century Valerius Aedituus, Porcius Licinus, Q. Lutatius Catulus, Quintius Atta; in the second half, Varro Atacinus, Licinius Calvus and Catullus, perhaps also Hortensius, C. Memmius Gemellus, Q. Scaevola, and others to whom erotic poems are attributed; in the Augustan period Augustus himself, Domitius Marsus, Pedo, Corniferus, Sulpicia. Under Domitian the epigram in various forms was treated in a masterly manner by Martial;

in Ausonius also there are many things of this kind, especially in the style of sepulchral inscriptions. Even in the sixth century we have a collection of epigrams by Luxorius. In modern times these productions have been collected and published under the name of the Latin Anthology.

1. Lyricorum iucunditas, elegorum lasciviae, iamborum amaritudo, epigrammatum lusus, Tac. dial. 10. — Ecquis nostrorum poetarum tam fluentes carminum delicias fecisset (as Anacreon)? nisi Catullus forte pauca et Calvus itidem pauca. nam Laevius implicata et Hortensius invenusta et Cinna inlepida et Memmius dura, ac deinceps omnes rudia fecerunt atque absona. Gell. XIX 9, 7; and ib. 10 sqq. versus Valeri Aeditui, .. item Porcii Licini et Q. Catuli are quoted, quibus mundius, venustius, limatius, tersius graecum latinumve nihil quidquam reperiri puto. Plin. Ep. V 3, 5 enumerates as authors of erotic poems: M. Tullium, C. Calvum, Asinium Polionem, M. Messalam, Q. Hortensium, M. Brutum, L. Sullam, Q. Catulum, Q. Scaevolam, Ser. Sulpicium, Varronem, Torquatum, immo Torquatos, C. Memmium, Lentulum Gaetulicum, Annaeum Senecam, Lucanum, .. Verginium Rufum, .. D. Julium, D. Augustum, D. Nernam, Tiberium Caesarem; then Neronem, further on (ib. 6) P. Vergilius, Cornelius Nepos et prius Attius Enniusque. There seems to have been an erotic anthology at an early period, from which it is supposed that Pliny, Gellius (l. c.) and Apuleius (apol. 9) derived their special knowledge in this field. For the epigrams see above 11, 3. Cicero's freedman, M. Tullius Laurea, wrote epigrams in Latin (Plin. N. H. XXXI 2) as well as in Greek (Anth. gr. II p. 90 sq.)

1. Catalecta veterum poetarum by Jos. Scaliger, Lugd. Bat. 1593. 1617. Epigrammata vett. e codicibus et lapidibus collecta, by P. Pithoeus, Paris 1590. Anthologia latina by P. Burmann, Amsterdam 1759 and 1773. 2 voll. 4°. Anthologia vett. latt. epigrammatum et poem. ed. H. Meyer, Lips. 1835. 2 voll. [Critical edition by A. Riese in the Teubner collection.] A critical revision of the old materials and collection of the numerous materials recently accumulated have been promised by L. Müller.

27. Iambics, familiar from the drama, were at an early time employed for other purposes, e. g. for epitaphs, as in that of Pacuvius. For the carmen maledicum the iambic metre seems to have been first employed among the Romans by Furius Bibaculus, after him by Catullus, Calvus, also the younger Cato, Horace in his Epodes, and Bassus. The Imperial period was not favourable to this species, and iambics were then mostly employed without special purpose. But part of the poems of Martial is in this metre, and in a later period Ausonius endeavoured to revive iambics in their original application.

1. Diomed. III p. 581 P. = 485, 11 sqq. K.: iambus est carmen maledicum. . . cuius carminis praecipui scriptores . . apud Romanos Lucilius

et Catullus et Horatius et Bibaculus. Quintil. X 1, 96: iambus non sane a Romanis celebratus est ut proprium opus, quibusdam interpositus. cuius acerbitas in Catullo, Bibaculo, Horatio, quamquam illi epodos interveniat, reperietur. Comp. ib. IX 4, 41: aspera et maledica'.. etiam in carmine iambis grassantur. X 1, 9: scriptores .. iamborum veterisque comoediae etiam in illis (parum verecundis verbis) sæpe laudantur. Ovid. Rem. am. 377 sqq.: liber in adversos hostes stringatur iambus, seu celer extremum seu trahat ille pedem (choliambics). Catull. 36,5: (truces vibrare iambos) and 40, 1 he uses iambus of maledica carmina in general, without regard to metre, also of hendecasyllabics, much as he himself and Martial after him employed them with preference.

2. Plut. Cato min. 7: *ὀργῇ καὶ νεότητι τρέψας ἑαυτὸν εἰς ἰάμβους πολλὰ τὸν Σκιπίωνα καθύβρισε, τῷ πικρῷ προσχρησάμενος τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου, τὸ δ' ἀκόλαστον ἀφεὶς καὶ παιδαριῶδες.* Ovid. Trist. IV 10, 47: Bassus quoque clarus iambo. Cf. Propert. I 4. The time and the kind of poetry would fit the rhetor Julius Bassus (Sen. p. 295. 303 Bu.). Lenaeus' satire (Suet. gramm. 15) and Ovid's Ibis were iambic in their subjects. Among the pseudo-Virgilian Catalecta 2 and 7 are in choliambics, 3—5 and 8 iambic; Matius' mimiambi were also choliambic, Petron. Sat. 5, Persius' prologue and part of the poems of Martial. Among the Priapeics we have also the iambus represented. Antistius Sosianus probrosa adversus principem (Nero) carmina (iambics?) factitavit volgavitque (62 A. D.), Vopisc. Car. 11, 2 (p. 221, 16 sq. Peter.). Jocular epigrams on contemporary events in hendecasyllabics in Lamprid. Alex. Sev. 38. In Ausonius see espec. Epigramm. 45—52 against the rhetor Rufus.

3. In the Inscriptions iambic senarii are not scarce; see 126, 3. Thus the inscription at Bonn on an altar by L. Fulvius Maximus (Rhen. Mus. XIX p. 53—62. Jahrb. d. rheinl. Alt. Fr. XXXVI p. 116 sqq. XXXVII p. 151 sqq. Annal. dell' Inst. arch. XXXVI p. 224 sqq.), the inscription in memory of the schoolmaster Fusius Philocalus (Hermes I p. 148—151, see ib. p. 151—155 [Trans. of the Phil. Soc. 1867 p. 250]), the epitaph of Senenia Pollia (Orelli-Henzen 6237. Ritschl, Rh. Mus. XVII p. 300 sqq.) and many others (comp. Fröhner, Philologus XIII p. 176. 183. 185.) Choliambics e. g. in Orelli 4828 (Rome), Mommsen I. R. N. 2001 (Nola), Jahrb. der rheinl. Alt. Fr. XXXII p. 63, Meyer Anth. lat. 1309. Epitaph of a dog in hendecasyllabics with reminiscences of Catullus, from Auch, Hermes I p. 68, [Trans. Phil. Soc. 1867 p. 251].

28. At the end of the Republic, when the knowledge of Greek literature at Rome had become more extensive and life more exciting, nearly every well-educated Roman would occasionally attempt some kind or other of small poems; even the more talented poets, e. g. Varro Atacinus, Laevius, Calvus and Catullus roamed undecidedly through various kinds and metrical forms; Catullus alone became the first real lyric poet among the Romans on account of the love and hatred embodied in his poems. Horace continued in his track

with much less personal pathos, but with refined critical taste. Others in his time did not get beyond mere playing and first attempts. In the first century of the Christian era formal elegance was very common, and as a consequence, there was much dallying with poetry; but not one of the numerous lyric poets of this or the next succeeding period gained eminence and lasting influence: e. g. Caesius Bassus, Saleius Bassus, Gaetulicus, Arruntius Stella, Vestricius Spurinna, the younger Pliny, P. Annius Florus, Voconius, Hadrian, Sentius Augurinus, Pompeius Saturnius, Annianus. This mastery over the form which incited many poets — e. g. Septimius Serenus and Terentianus Maurus — to write verses merely to give examples of the various metres, — is very brilliantly represented by Statius and Ausonius, even by Sidonius Apollinaris; nor is the Pervigilium Veneris a despicable specimen of the lyric art of the second and third centuries. Among the Christian poets of the fourth century Prudentius is remarkable for the variety of the melic metres employed by him, and Ambrosius for the depth of feeling displayed in his hymns.

1. The oldest melic poets under the influence of the Roman notions and on account of their playful character, style their works nugae, ineptiae, (Eroto-)paegnia, opuscula etc. Many of the poets enumerated by Pliny (Ep. V 3, 5: see above 26, 1) belong to this class, perhaps also Cassius of Parma.' In the Augustan period perhaps Titius (Hor. Ep. I 3, 9 sqq.), Julus Antonius (Hor. O. IV 2) and Rufus (Ov. ex Ponto IX 16, 28); besides Maecenas' attempts and Melissus' Ineptiae; also a number of Priapeia, 87 jocular and obscene poems on Priapus in various metres, espec. iambics and hendecasyllabics, the authors generally anonymous, in the first century of the Christian era, from Catullus to Martial: Their text is found in the edd. of the Latin Anthology and in Bücheler's smaller edition of Petronius (Berlin 1862) p. 109 sqq., see also his Vindiciae libri Priapeiorum, Rhen. Mus. XVIII 381 — 415. [also in L. Müller's edition of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius, in the Teubner coll.] a disquisition on them by J. F. Wernicke, I. Thorn 1853. 144 pp. 8°.

2. Quintil. X 1, 96: lyricorum Horatius fere solus legi dignus... si quem adicere velis, is erit Caesius Bassus, quem nuper vidimus; sed eum longe praecedunt ingenia viventium (perhaps he has in his mind especially Arruntius Stella, Vestricius Spurinna, probably even Statius, which would also give us a corrective for his judgment on Bassus). These late lyric poets lacked less the form than the subjects. versiculi of Pliny, on erotic subjects, espec. hendecasyllabics, Ep. V 3, 1, VII 4, 1. 7 sqq. His contemporary is Passennus Paullus, an imitator of Horace (ib. IX 22, 2). Voconius poeta (under Hadrian) versu lascivus, mente

pudicus (Apul. apol. 11); ipsius etiam D. Hadriani multa id genus legere me memini (ib.). International or involuntary exaggeration of the estimation of contemporary poets, e. g. also with regard to Numerianus (Caesar 284 A. v.) in Vopisc. Car. 11, 2: versu talis fuisse praedicatur ut omnes poetas sui temporis vicerit. A votive inscription by Alfenus Fortunatus in Ionics, Renier, Inscr. de l' Alg. 157.

29. Through the influence of the Alexandrine poets the Elegy, at the close of the Republic, gained ground at Rome, and there the disciples far surpassed their Greek originals in truth and warmth of sentiment as well as in formal finish. Catullus, it is true, moves in this kind in general with a certain awkwardness; Tibullus produced masterpieces, Propertius passionate pictures, and Ovid was quite at home in the Elegy. In the first century of the Christian era this kind was long fashionable, and was employed even in the schools for practice in style. But the intrinsic worth of these productions decreased in proportion. Later on, this metre shared the fate of the epic verse, being employed in all kinds of subjects, such as Epithalamium, Epicedium and Epitaph, enigmas, acrostichs and centos; and when the ancient prosody which was based on quantity began to decay before other forms of poetry had been developed, those two metres, being the most popular and widely used, were the first to suffer.

1. Diomed. III p. 481 sq. P. = 484, 17 sqq. K.: elegia est carmen compositum hexametro versu pentametroque .. quod genus carminis praecipue scripserunt apud Romanos Propertius et Tibullus et Gallus, imitati Graecos Callimachum et Euphoriona. Quintil. X 1, 93: elegia quoque Graecos provocamus. cuius mihi tersus atque elegans maxime videtur auctor Tibullus. sunt qui Propertium malint. Ovidius utroque lascivior, sicut durior Gallus. — For their chronogical succession see Ovid. Trist. IV 10, 63 sq.: successor fuit hic (Tibullus) tibi, Galle, Propertius illi; quartus ab his serie temporis ipse fui. — Cic. Tusc. III 19, 45 on Ennius: o poetam egregium, quamquam ab his cantoribus Euphorionis (Calvus, Catullus, Cinna etc.) contemnitur. The writers of short elegies (i. e. epigrams) in this period are enumerated above 25, with note 1. To them we should perhaps add Cassius of Parma (Hor. Ep. I 4, 3). In the Augustan period we have the author of the third book of Tibullus (Lygdamus). — An antithetic composition is attempted to be traced by C. Prien, on the symmetry and antithetic composition of Roman Elegy, Lübeck 1867. 85 pp. 4°.

2. Persius I 51 sq.: si qua elegidia crudi dictarunt proceres. Juv. I 3 sq.: impune .. mihi recitaverit ille togatas, hic elegos? In the reign of Domitian, Arruntius Stella composed elegies, in the time of the younger Pliny that writer himself (Ep. VII 4, 3. 7) and Passennus Paullus, eq. rom.,

municeps and a descendant of Propertius (Plin. Ep. IV 15. IX 22, 1 sq.). Elegi attributed to Horace were considered spurious by Suetonius. Elegiac ἀδέσποτα, such as in obitum Maecenatis, Consolatio ad Liviam de morte Drusi, Elegia ad Valerium Messalam and other poems of the same kind are found in Wernsdorf, poetae lat. min. III and IV; of these the Consolatio was most probably composed by an Italian of the 15th century: see M. Haupt, Epicedium Drusi, cum commentariis, Lips. 1849. 38 pp. 4°. A refutation has been attempted by Adler, Anclam 1851. 4°. A modern fabrication is also the elegiac Cento of an author who calls himself Asinius Cornelius Gallus, in Wernsdorf III p. 183 sqq. In the middle ages (at the very earliest in the time of Theodoric) we have the six elegies of the Etruscan Maximianus, erroneously published under the name of (Cornelius) Gallus by their first editor (Pompon. Gauricus, Ven. 1501. 4°): see Wernsdorf III p. 126 sqq. VI p. 207 sqq.

3. Epithalamia etc. espec. by Statius, Ausonius, Sidonius Apollinaris and Claudian. — Centos (poems composed of detached pieces) patched together espec. from lines of Homer and Virgil (Auson. Idyll. XIII praef. Isidor. Orig. I 38, 25), by Hosidius Geta (Medea), Ausonius (cento nuptialis = Idyll. XIII), Proba Faltonia (biblical history), Sedulius (de verbi incarnatione), Pomponius (Isid. l. l.), Maro the younger (de ecclesia). In a small degree already in Petron. 132, p. 185 Bü. Others are found in Meyer's Latin Anthology, No. 252. 575. 693. Comp. B. Borgen, de centonibus Homericis et Vergilianis etc. Copenh. 1828. 4°. L. Müller, metr. lat. p. 465 sq.

4. The enigmas were an imitation of a Greek custom. A poet of enigmas occurs only in the fourth or fifth century in Symposius, later on in Aldhelmus and Tathvinus (in the 8th century). Latin riddles of this kind were a favourite pastime in the monasteries, and many of these productions survive in mss.: see L. Müller, Jahn's Jahrb. 93 p. 266—272. 565. 95, p. 497.

5. Acrostichs, also imitated from Greek literature, espec. to disguise a name (e. g. of an author), are not foreign even to the older Roman literature; Ennius composed one (Cic. de div. II 54, 111) and later on they became more and more frequent. One on Fortunatus in Renier, Inscr. de l' Alg. 2074. another (Lovella) ib. 2928. Christian ones in de Rossi, Inscr. christ. n. 425 (A. D. 395). 753. 834. See Rhein. Mus. XX p. 138. 457. 634 sq. Philologus XII p. 183 sq.

6. The decay of the form (in language, prosody and metre) begins in the plebeian inscriptions as early as the third century and from then assumes larger dimensions. A glaring instance of this is the inscription of L. Praecilius Fortunatus (Renier l. l. 2074). See W. Fröhner, Philologus XIII p. 170 sqq.

30. As was the case in Greek literature, the Romans did not obtain and develope a prose-style until a proportionately late period. Previously all was composed in the Saturnian metre, a form free from difficulty in proportion to its laxity. The first

step towards prose-composition was taken by Appius Claudius (474) in publishing one of his speeches. But as the succeeding writers employed the Greek language, the history of prose does not begin, properly speaking, before Cato Major. For long, however, the written speech remained insignificant by the side of the spoken one, and became its equal only in the time of Cicero when the prose attained to its climax and became the adequate expression of the author's individuality. A rhetorical character remained to it for ever from its origin. In the first century of the Imperial period it begins already to decay, by being mixed with poetical diction and becoming estranged from natural expression. The decay of accidence and syntax begins also about this time. Later on, the plebeian element found admission. And when the influence of provincial writers who were not guided by a native sense of language and who mixed up the diction and style of all periods, became prevalent in literature, the confusion became still greater. The language of literature became more and more different from the living language, and became entirely dependent upon the culture attained by each writer, which continually fell to a lower level. The more the provincial idioms were developed into the Romance languages, the more did Latin become a foreign tongue.

31. For history, as a storehouse of the glorious deeds of their ancestors, to be imitated by present and future generations, the Romans possessed a very ready mind. To the very oldest time belongs the custom of ex officio-chronicles by the Pontifices, annual and monthly registers, the fasti and annales, libri pontificii, commentarii regum, magistratuum, and from the beginning of the Republic the yearly change of the magistrates was an additional stimulus to keep registers of this kind. But the families also had sufficient opportunities of preserving the memory of past events in the custom of keeping family chronicles, in the imagines, later on in the pedigrees, in the laudationes funebres, the ancestral songs during meals. On the other hand it should be confessed that history (as it was generally in antiquity) was with the Romans in a dangerously close connexion with the interests of the state and the family. The desire of finding out historical truth and perpetuating it as such is foreign to the Romans;

the desire of placing their nation, family, party or person in a favorable light was all the stronger. Later on the rhetorical element was added to the further detriment of historical veracity. But even more foreign than historical criticism was historical art to the Roman for a long time. Sallust is the first cultivated historian of the Romans; all previous productions are either mere registers or the materials are undigested, and there is a want of historical style. The oldest historians even preferred writing in Greek, most probably because Latin had not been sufficiently cultivated for historical composition, but no doubt also in order to limit the knowledge of history to the narrow circles of the Patricians.

1. Collections of the fragments of the historians by A. Krause (Vitae et fragmenta hist. vett. rom. Berlin 1833) and (down to Cicero's time) by C. L. Roth in Gerlach's edition of Sallust of the year 1852, p. 249 sqq. A new collection by Reifferscheid is advertised [and the first volume of one by H. Peter has made its appearance, Leipzig, Teubner, 1870].

2. G. J. Vossius, de historicis latinis, Lugd. Bat. 1627. 1651. 4°. Additions to this by J. A. Fabricius, Hamburg 1709. M. Hanke, de Rom. rerum scriptoribus, Lips. 1669. 1675. 4°. H. Ulrici, Characteristics of ancient historiography, Berlin 1833. L. de Closset, essai sur l'historiographie des Romains, Brussels 1849. C. Nipperdey, Contributions to a history of Roman historiography, Philologus VI p. 131—140. F. Althaus, de historiae conscribendae historia, Berlin 1852, p. 49—62. F. D. Gerlach, The historians of the Romans from the earliest times until Orosius, Stuttgart (Hoffmann) 1855. The introductions of the Roman histories of Niebuhr, Wachsmuth, Blum, Schwegler and Mommsen (I² p. 432 sqq.). Essay on the credibility of early Roman history by L. O. Bröcker, Basel 1855, [and the wellknown work of] G. C. Lewis. [See also Dr. Dyer's History of the Kings of Rome.] H. Nissen, critical disquisitions on the sources of the fourth and fifth decades of Livy, Berlin 1863.

3. Pontifices, penes quos scribendae historiae potestas fuit, Vopisc. Tac. 1, 1. For a long time no plebeian, and then no man of unfree birth could undertake the writing of history: L. Voltacilius Pilutus .. primus omnium libertinorum, ut Cornelius Nepos opinatur, scribere historiam exorsus, non nisi ab honestissimo quoque scribi solitam ad id tempus, Suet. rhet. 3. Frequently cases of precedence are referred to, e. g. Liv. VIII 18, 12: memoria ex annalibus repetita .. dictatorem creari placuit. — Town-chronicles existed also out of Rome. Liv. VIII 10, 8: inter Romanos Latinosque qui eius pugnae memoriam posteris tradiderunt. In a later period both were united, and in this manner Valerius of Antium becomes a Roman historian.

4. Paedagogic tendencies. Plut. Cato mai. 20: *καὶ τὰς ἱστορίας δὲ συγγράψαι φησὶν αὐτὸς* (Cato) *ἰδίᾳ χειρὶ καὶ μεγάλοις γράμμασιν ὅπως οἴκοθεν ὑπάρχῃ τῷ παιδὶ πρὸς ἐμπειρίαν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ πατρίων ὠφελεῖσθαι.*

5. Quintilian is so little able to discriminate history and novel as to say X 1, 31: historia est proxima poetis et quodammodo carmen solutum, et scribitur ad narrandum, non ad probandum. Cic. Brut. 11, 42: quoniam concessum est rhetoribus ementiri in historiis, ut aliquid dicere possint argutius. de leg. I 2, 5: cum sit (historia) opus, ut tibi quidem videri solet, unum hoc oratorium maxime (probably espec. concerning style). Comp. below 32, 2. Ideological in Tac. Agr. 1: apud priores .. celeberrimus quisque ingenio ad prodendam virtutis memoriam, sine gratia aut ambitione, bonae tantum conscientiae pretio ducebatur.

32. Until the end of the second Punic war Rome produced only history and sources of history. When history came to be narrated, its form was naturally like the old annals. Hence the oldest Roman historians are Annalists. There were two generations of these, an older one reaching into the seventh century v. c. and registering in a meagre chronicle-like form, yet with a certain reliability, the events in their annual succession; and a later one writing for a reading public, detailing the historical materials and adorning them in its own fashion. At the head of the older generation stands Q. Fabius Pictor, who was succeeded by L. Cincius Alimentus, C. Acilius and A. Postumius Albinus. All of them dealt summarily with the oldest period and at greater length with contemporary history, all wrote in Greek, as did also the son of the older Africanus. In Pictor and Acilius, however, Latin compositions soon followed. The first who wrote in Latin was Cato in his Origines, who at the same time extended the subject to a history of Italy. His example was followed with regard to the language by L. Cassius Hemina and perhaps also Ser. Fabius Pictor; then by L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (Cens. 621), Fabius Maximus Servilianus, C. Semponius Tuditanus (Cens. 625), L. Scribonius Libo, Vennonius, and Cn. Gellius, of whom, however, the last at least possessed already the diffuseness of the later generation of Annalists. The influence of the Greek style appears in C. Fannius and even more in L. Coelius Antipater; on the other hand Polybius' pragmatical method clearly influenced Sempronius Asellio. In the same time Clodius Licinus and Cn. Aufidius continued in the old direction, the latter even writing again in Greek. In the time of Sulla we meet with several writers of memoirs and autobiographies, viz. M. Aemilius Scaurus, P. Rutilius Rufus, Q. Lutatius Catulus, Sulla himself, and in Greek L. Licinius Lucullus. In the same time the later style of Annals is prominently represented in Q. Claudius

Quadrigarius and the exaggerating Valerius Antias. More respectable was C. Licinius Macer, the last real Annalist, in as much as L. Cornelius Sisenna (praetor 676) adopted in his contemporary history an arrangement more in accordance with the subject-matter than with chronology. Late annalists in the Ciceronian period are Atticus and Q. Tubero. But as late as Tacitus the form of Annals asserted itself, and even many biographies of Emperors were in the form of Annals.

1. Wherever, after the middle of the seventh century, annals are mentioned, histories in the form of Annals are meant: Schwegler, Rom. Hist. I p. 11 sq. 'Annales' denotes chronicles, and historia as a rule a pragmatic account of events witnessed by the writer (Gell. IV 18, 1 sqq. Serv. Aen. I 383) though both were frequently combined, the first part of a historical work consisting of annales, the latter of historia. In this manner either name might be chosen for the same work. H. Nissen, Critical Investigations p. 75 with note. Comp. F. Thiersch, Münchner Gel. Anz. 1848, No. 131 sqq.

2. There was great liberty allowed in using previous writers; subsequent writers copied the works of their predecessors with more or less additional matter and changes, with or without express mention of the name. Generally a writer would found his work on one principal source, changing this according to other sources or individual pleasure. H. Nissen, Critical Invest. p. 77—80. 90. Th. Pluess, New Swiss Museum VI (1866) p. 47 sq.

3. Cic. de or. II 12, 52 sq.: erat historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio. Tac. dial. 22: nulli sensus tarda et inerti structura in morem annalium componantur. Dionys. I, 7: *εἰσὶ δὲ* (the *πραγματεῖαι* of the Annalists) *ταῖς ἑλληνικαῖς χρονογραφίαις ἐοικυῖαι.* According to the laws of rethorical style Cic. judges leg. I 2, 6: post annales pontificum maximorum .. si aut ad Fabium aut ad .. Catonem aut ad Pisonem aut ad Fannium aut ad Vennonium venias, quanquam alius alio plus habet virium, tamen quid tam exile quam isti omnes? Fannii autem aetati coniunctus Antipater paulo inflavit vehementius .. sed tamen admonere reliquos potuit ut accuratius scriberent. Ecce autem successere huic Gellius, Clodius, Asellio, nihil ad Coelium, sed potius ad antiquorum languorem et inscitiam. Dionys. Ant. I 7: *ἐκ τῶν ἱστοριῶν .. ἃς οἱ πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐπαινούμενοι Ῥωμαίων συνέγραψαν, Πόρκιός τε Κάτων καὶ Φάβιος Μάξιμος καὶ Οὐαλέριος ὁ Ἀντιεὺς καὶ Αἰκίννιος Μάκερ, Αἴλιοί τε καὶ Γέλλιοι καὶ Καλπούρνιοι, καὶ ἕτεροι συχνοὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἄνδρες οὐκ ἀφανεῖς.* The oldest annalists (Q. Fabius and L. Cincius) are previously mentioned by Dionys. I 6.

3. Mommsen, H. of Rome II². p. 453 sq. L. Kieserling, de rer. rom. scriptoribus quibus T. Livius usus est, Berlin 1858. H. v. d. Bergh, de antiquissimis annalium scriptoribus romanis, Greifsw. 1859. W. Teuffel, in Pauly's R. E. I p. 1018—1020. On the use made of the priestly

annals by the (later) Annalists and their influence on Livy, see H. Nissen, Critical Invest. p. 86 sqq.

5. Sempronius Asellio in Gell. V 18, 8: inter eos qui annales relinquere voluissent et eos qui res gestas a Romanis perscribere conati essent omnium rerum hoc interfuit. Annales libri tantummodo quod factum quoque anno gestum sit, ea demonstrabant, i. e. quasi qui diarium scribunt, quam Graeci ἐφημερίδα vocant. Nobis non modo satis esse video quod factum esset, id pronuntiare, sed etiam quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent demonstrare.

6, L. Wiese, de vitarum scriptoribus romanis, Berlin 1840. 4°. W. H. D. Suringar, de romanis autobiographis, Lugd. Bat. 1846. 4°. Köchly and Rüstow, Introd. to Caesar's Gallic War (Gotha 1857) p. 3—6. The apologetic tendency of these memoirs was so pronounced that Cicero (Brut. 29, 112) actually calls a work of this kind laudes. What others did not do themselves, was done for them by officious clients, and later on by starving Greek literati.

33. In the Ciceronian period the rich materials furnished by contemporary history together with the spreading of a certain facility of composition, caused many to compose historical relations. Thus besides Atticus and Cicero himself also Hortensius, Varro, Procilius, Lucceius, Libo, Domitius and Egnatius. Prominent on account of their contents or form are only the performances of Cornelius Nepos, Caesar and Sallust. Caesar provided also materials for future historians by establishing (a. u. c. 695) an official journal. The Civil War produced, besides Caesar's own writings, many other party histories. On Caesar's side wrote Hirtius, Oppius and Cornelius Balbus, Pompeius was vindicated by Voltacilius Pilutus and T. Ampius Balbus, and Cicero by his faithful Tiro. M. Antony's Parthian war was related by Dellius. Among the opposite party M. Brutus wrote also memoirs, and his step-son Bibulus and friend Volumnius historical treatises in his praise. Contemporary history was also treated in the Annals of Tanusius Geminus and partly by Q. Tubero, the Civil War itself by Asinius Pollio and M. Valerius Messala. The Augustan period produced, in Livy's Roman History, a work of formal perfection, and the first Universal History (an idea only timidly approached by Varro, Atticus and Cornelius Nepos) was written by Pompeius Trogus. In the course of the Imperial period the due appreciation of the affairs of old Rome disappeared rapidly; so did the possibility of a courageous and truthful relation of contemporary

or recent events. Servile flattery and rhetoric gained ground. In the reign of Tiberius, Velleius Paterculus wrote servilely, at least in respect to his contemporaries, and Valerius Maximus is colourless; for candour Labienus suffered under Augustus, and Cremutius Cordus under Tiberius. Less question arose about the historical works of members of the reigning family, e. g. those of Augustus, Tiberius, Agrippina, later on those of the copious writer Claudius and still later Trajan (Dacica) and Septimius Severus. Curtius chose a neutral territory, and Aufidius Bassus as well as Pliny the elder confined themselves to foreign events. Yet through the whole of the first century the historic sense was only smouldering under the ashes: a fact proved not only by the large number of historical works of this period, on which we have traditions more or less dim; e. g. by Seneca the elder, Servilius Nonianus, Cluvius, Lentulus Gaetulicus, Fabius Rusticus, Cornelius Thuscus, but also by the appearance of a writer like Tacitus in one of the first intervals of despotic rule. With rhetoric, however, history always remained in a dangerously close connexion; the more this degenerated, especially by the influence of Fronto's school, the deeper sank history in estimation and merit. The historical works of the Imperial period are also characterised by a concentration upon the mere personal element, to which are due both a number of biographies of private persons, and the kind of historical composition begun by Suetonius and his successors. Historians of this class, i. e. of court-events, and biographers of Emperors, were especially Marius Maximus, Junius Cordus, Aemilius Parthenianus, Aelius Maurus, Curius Fortunatianus, Fulvius Asprianus, and others, from whose works the 6 so-called Scriptores historiae augustae — Aelius Lampridius, Julius Capitolinus, Volcatius Gallicanus, Aelius Spartianus, Trebellius Pollio, and Flavius Vopiscus — derived their compositions, valuable to us in the absence of better sources. In the history of the fourth century we have an excellent authority in Ammianus Marcellinus. With regard to the history of the republican time in this period of decay, Livy became the exclusive authority, so much so that even those old sketches of republican history, which are by no means mere extracts from Livy, e. g. Florus and Victor's viri illustres, were still considered as such by later readers.

Livy himself was thought too prolix, and his work was (at the latest in the third century) reduced to a kind of abstract in the shape of tables, used by Obsequens and Cassiodorus, as well as Vopiscus, Eutropius, Sex. Rufus and Pseudo-Idatius. Other sources were used by Licinianus and L. Ampelius. After the fourth century the influence of Christianity was felt here also. The chronographer of the year 354 gives, besides consular Fasti, also an Easter-table and, with a list of the praefecti urbis, also one of the Roman Bishops and Martyrs. Sulpicius Severus' chronicles (c. 400) contain a summary of biblical and post-biblical history; Orosius' work has a Christian and apologetic purpose; the chronicles begin with Adam. In the 5th and 6th century it was a common custom to copy from one another: thus St. Jerome copied Eusebius, Prosper (A. D. 455) St. Jerome, Victorius (Paschale, A. D. 457) Prosper, Cassiodorus (519) Victorius, Jordanis (551) Cassiodorus, and all so as to continue their predecessors to their own time. Cassiodorus and Jordanis have, however, an independent value, as they employed also other works, and they are, with Gildas the Wise (559), Gregory of Tours (593), Isidor of Seville (628), the last representatives of antiquity in the field of history. A whole century after them the medieval Latin historiography commences in the Monastic Annals, among which those proceeding from the Anglo-Saxon monasteries (e. g. Beda) are the most valuable. Under the influence of these Monasteries in the Empire of the Carlovingians, the works of Paulus Diaconus and Eginhard were composed.

1. Tac. Hist. I 1: postquam bellatum apud Actium .. magna ingenia cessere: simul veritas pluribus modis infracta, primum inscitia reip. ut alienae, mox libidine adsentandi aut rursus odio adversus dominantes. A. I 1: temporibus Augusti dicendis non defuere decora ingenia, donec gliscente adulatione deterrerentur. Tiberii Gaique et Claudii ac Neronis res florentibus ipsis ob metum falsae, postquam occiderant, recentibus odiis compositae sunt. An instance of the latter kind is probably C. Fannius who had related exitus occisorum aut relegatorum a Nerone (Plin. Ep. V 5, 3).

2. Plin. Ep. 5, 3 of C. Fannius: tres libros absolverat subtiles .. atque inter sermonem historiamque medios. According to the ideas of the period (see Quintilian above 31, 5) a historical work required more élan, imagination, eloquentia. Tac. dial. 23: eloquentia Aufidii Bassi aut Servilii Noniani. Agr. 10: quae priores nondum comperta (on Britain's

situm populosque) eloquentia percoluere rerum fide tradentur. Hence the alternative, to resign either eloquentia or veritas and fides. Vopisc. Prob. 2, 7: mihi id animi fuit ut non Sallustios, Livios, Tacitos, Trogos atque omnes disertissimos imitarer viros in vita principum et temporibus disserendis, sed Marium Maximum, Saturnium Tranquillum, Fabium Marcellinum, Gargilium Martialem, ceterosque qui haec et talia non tam diserte quam vere memoriae tradiderunt. Licinianus writes from a similar point of view: Sallustium non ut historicum puto, sed ut oratorem legendum; nam et tempora reprehendit sua et delicta carpit et contiones ingerit et dat in censum loca, montes, flumina et hoc genus amoena et culta et comparat disserendo. Hence also such judgments as Seneca's N. Q. VII 16, 1 sq.: nec magna molitione detrahenda est auctoritas Ephoro: historicus est. . . . Haec in commune de tota natione (of the historians), quae adprobari opus suum et fieri populare non putet posse nisi illud mendacio adsperserit. On the historical compositions of the Frontoniani see Lucian's *πῶς δεῖ συγγράφειν τὴν ἱστορίαν.*

3. Collections of letters belong to the spontaneous sources of history. Real letters not intended for publication are especially useful as a mirror of the persons and of the period. The writer is there without constraint both in the contents and in the form. Cic. Phil. II 4, 7: quam multa ioca solent esse in epistulis, quae, prolata si sint, inepta videantur! quam multa seria, neque tamen ullo modo divolganda! ad Fam. XI 21, 1: epistulas quotidianis verbis texere solemus. XV 21, 4: ego illas Calvo litteras misi, non plus quam has quas nunc legis existimans exituras. aliter enim scribimus quod eos solos quibus mittimus, aliter quod multos lecturos putamus. Quintil. IX 4, 19: oratio soluta, qualis in sermone et epistulis. Plin. Ep. VI 16, 22: aliud est epistulam, aliud historiam, aliud amico, aliud omnibus scribere. Real letters of this kind by Cato to his son (see 110, 4), and by Cornelia to her son C. Gracchus (see 112, 6) were extant. A very important source of the history of his time is, as is well known, Cicero's correspondence, even in its present incomplete condition. The same holds good of the letters of Pliny the younger, though one can see that they are written with an eye to publication, and also of those of Symmachus and Sidonius Apollinaris; we should here also mention the letters of St. Jerome and espec. Cassiodorus' collection of decrees (Var.). As a mere form the elder Africanus employed the form of a letter in the relation of his achievements addressed to king Philip, and also Scipio Nasica in his account of the campaign against Perseus, in which he had taken part (Plut. Aem. Paul. 15); later on it was employed for almost any subject, e. g. for learned discussions, as in Varro's Epistolae and Epistolicae quaestiones, in Sinnius Capito, Valgius Rufus, Valerius Messala, or for philosophical commentations, e. g. by Seneca. Jurists (e. g. Antistius Labeo, Ateius Capito) using this form, did so, no doubt, in advice (responsa) concerning disputed points of law. In the Imperial period the writing of letters was treated as a branch of style (comp. Fronto),

and in the schools of rhetors epistolary composition was a favourite theme, generally connected with famous names: in this way many supposititious letters arose, e. g. Horace's epistola prosa oratione quasi commendantis se Maecenati, considered spurious by Suetonius already; so later on the pretended correspondence of Seneca and the Apostle Paul, and perhaps also Lucan's Epistolae ex Campania. Supposititious letters are especially numerous in Greek literature.

4. Another important source of history is found in the Inscriptions, the earliest of which date from the sixth century V. C.; they become more numerous in the 7th century, and inscriptions of the Imperial period are found in all the provinces of the Roman Empire in great abundance. Of the old collections we will name here: M. Smetius' Inscriptiones antiquae, Lugd. B. 1588 fol., J. Gruter's Thesaurus Inscriptionum, Heidelb. 1603. 1663. Amst. 1707 fol., Th. Reinesius' Syntagma Inscriptionum antiquarum, Lips. 1682 fol., Muratori's Novus thesaurus veterum inscriptionum, Milan 1739. 4 voll. fol.; of the modern ones J. C. Orelli's Inscriptionum latinarum selectarum amplissima collectio, Zürich 1828. 2 voll., augmented by W. Henzen with a third vol. 1856, and the new and original works of Th. Mommsen: Inscriptiones regni Neapolitani latinae, Lips. 1852. fol. Inscriptiones confoederationis helveticae latinae, Zürich 1854. Inscriptiones latinae antiquissimae ad C. Julii Caesaris mortem = Corpus Inscriptionum latinarum Vol. I, Berlin 1863, fol., and of F. Ritschl: Priscae Latinitatis monumenta epigraphica ad archetyporum fidem exemplis lithographis repraesentata = Corpus inscr. lat. Vol. primi tabulae lithographae, Berlin 1862, fol. mag., to which may be added L. Renier's Inscriptions romaines de l'Algérie, Paris 1855 sq. fol. and others. The principle of local arrangement, which will be adopted in the following volumes of the Berlin Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, is also followed in L. M. Jordão's Portugalliae inscriptiones romanae, Vol. 1. Lisbon 1859. fol.; J. W. Chr. Steiner's Codex inscriptionum rom. Rheni, Darmstadt 1837—54, 2 parts, and Codex inscr. rom. Danubii et Rheni, Seligenstadt 1851—62, 4 parts; Th. W. Rappeneggers's Roman Inscriptions in the Grand-Duchy of Bade, Mannheim 1845; J. v. Hefner's The inscriptions and statues of Bavaria under Roman rule, 3rd ed. Munich 1852; Chr. Stälin's History of Wirtemberg, Vol. I; W. Brambach's Corpus inscriptionum rhenanarum, Elberfeld 1865; J. M. Ackner and F. Müller's Roman Inscriptions in Dacia, Vienna 1865, and others. (Inscriptiones latinae in terris Nassov. repertae, Wiesbaden 1854). The Christian Inscriptions of J. B. de Rossi are arranged according to subjects and chronology: Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores, I. Rome 1861. On the method of epigraphic studies comp. W. Henzen, On Latin epigraphic studies in their present condition, in the Allgem. Monatsschr. I (Brunswick 1853) p. 157—184. F. Ritschl, Monumenta epigraphica tria . . commentariis grammaticis illustrata (Berlin 1852. 4°.), in his Enarratio in P. L. M. E. and in numerous treatises, about to be collected in his Opuscula. On the metrical inscriptions see F. Bücheler in Jahn's

Jahrb. LXXVII p. 60—78, and W. Fröhner, in the Philologus XIII p. 165—191. In general see also K. Zell, Manual of Roman Epigraphic, Heidelberg 1850—57. 3 parts.

5. In the Imperial period we have, besides the ordinary historical sources (e. g. the acta), also the ephemerides (diaries), e. g. Aurcliani (Vopisc. Aurel. 1, 6), Turduli Gallicani (Vopisc. Prob. 2, 2. comp. 3, 4. 5, 1). Hence may have been derived the small personal details chronicled by these writers, because etiam minora plerique desiderant (Capit. Mar. et Balb. 6, 1). In the earlier parts of the Imperial period biographies of private persons were written by Pliny the Elder, of his friend Pomponius Secundus (Plin. Ep. III 5, 3), by Julius Secundus of Julius Asiaticus (Tac. dial. 14), by Tacitus of Agricola, by Claudius Pollio of his friend Annius (Plin. Ep. VII 31, 5). Of a similar character were the laudes of Paetus Thrasea and Helvidius Priscus by Herennius Senecio and Arulenus Rusticus (Suet. Dom. 10. Plin. Ep. VII 19, 5).

6. On Livy's authority and influence in the later Imperial time see Th. Mommsen, Cassiodorus p. 551 sq., who also observes that the abridgment in question must have prefixed to each year the names of the consuls in the ablative. On the habit of copying from one another see Mommsen l. l. p. 565 sq. The extent to which this was thought admissible, is shown by Ausonius concluding his fasti (from the foundation of the City until his own time) with the lines: hactenus adscripsi fastos. Si fors volet, ultra adiciam; si non, qui legis, adicies.

7. The observations on the conclusion of ancient and the beginning of medieval historiography are taken from A. v. Gutschmid, Grenzboten 1863, I p. 341 sq.

8. Fenestella, Messala Corvinus and the historia Papirii are forgeries of the 15th century. Th. Mommsen, Hermes I (1866) p. 135 sq.

34. From the same motives as historiography and in connexion with it, antiquarian learning arose and prospered among the Romans, both as to subjects and language. The study of the latter was due to the practical necessity of fixing in writing the developing sounds of the language. Most writers, however, turned their attention to the mos maiorum i. e. the investigation of the customs and institutions of olden times. Such are Cincius Alimentus, Cato, M. Fulvius Nobilior, Cassius Hemina, C. Sempronius Tuditanus, M. Junius Gracchanus, L. Julius Caesar. After the seventh century, students of the archaic literature became frequent, represented not only by L. Attius and Lucilius, but also by Porcius Licinus, Q. Valerius of Sora, Saevius Nicanor, Aurelius Opilius, Sisenna, Octavius Lampadio, M. Antonius Gnipho, Q. Cosconius, Volcatius Sedigitus, Santra, and above all L. Aelius

Stilo. The Stoic philosopher Crates, who came to Rome in 595 V.C. as ambassador, excited a lasting interest for linguistic studies. Etymology was attempted by some in always resorting to Greek (Hypsicrates), by others in endeavouring to explain everything on the basis of Latin (Varro, Nigidius Figulus, Labeo). In the Ciceronian time, when Rome was recognised as the centre of the whole intellectual life of the Empire and contained all helps to study, these studies reached their highest stage of development in Varro, and besides him Nigidius Figulus, Sisinnius Capito, Valerius Cato, Atteius Philologus and others. Among the statesmen Caesar himself wrote de analogia, Appius Claudius (cos. 700) de disciplina augurali. In the Augustan time antiquarian investigation was once more zealously cultivated by Julius Hyginus, Verrius Flaccus, M. Valerius Messala, Julius Modestus, Scribonius Aphrodisius, L. Crassitius, Pomponius Marcellus, succeeded by Asconius Pedianus and A. Cornelius Celsus. Celsus' versatility was even surpassed by that of Pliny the Elder, and even in the second century Suetonius, Sulpicius Apollinaris and Fronto, exhibit a varied culture and literary activity. But on the whole it may be said that, since the first century, a school-system with its comparatively limited views gained ascendancy, and in this department the grammarians became the most important. Thus we have M. Valerius Probus of Berytus, Annaeus Cornutus, Caesius Bassus, Aemilius Asper, Flavius Caper, Q. Remmius Palaemon, Caesellius Vindex, Urbanus, Velius Longus, Nisus; in Hadrian's reign A. Gallius, Terentius Scaurus; under Antonius Pius C. Julius Romanus, Dositheus Magister; in the 3rd century Helenius Acro, Sacerdos and Censorinus, Volcatius, Haterianus. Only about the middle of the fourth century we meet again grammarians of more distinction, most of them authors of manuals (artes), such as Marius Victorinus, Aelius Donatus, Comminianus, Charisius, Diomedes, Probus the younger; Commentators like Ti. Claudius Donatus, Aruntius Celsus, Servius Marius Honoratus, Pomponius Porphyrio; Lexicographers like Festus and Nonius Marcellus. In the fifth century we have Macrobius and Agroecius, and at the commencement of the sixth Priscian. In this department, too, the semblance of variety and stir surpasses the reality, since here also preceding labours were copied to a great extent.

1. Sueton. de grammaticis. — Suringar, historia critica choliastarum lat., Lugd. Bat. 1834 sq. 3 voll. L. Lersch, on the linguistic speculations of the ancients, Bonn 1838—1841. 3 voll. — van Heusde, de L. Aelio Stilone (1839) p. 17—33. Gräfenhan, A history of classical philology in ancient times, Bonn 1843 sqq. espec. vol. IV (1850).

2. L. Mercklin, the Isagogic writings of the Romans, Philologus IV p. 413—437. O. Jahn, On Roman Encyclopaedias, in Ber. der sächs. Ges. d. W. 1850, p. 263 sqq.

3. Collections of the extant writings of the grammatici latini by D. Gothofredus, Geneva 1595. 1622. 4., El. Putsche (Hanover 1605. 4), Fr. Lindemann (Lips. 1831—40. 4. incomplete; only t. III and IV 1), and espec. by H. Keil, Lips. 1857 sqq. Comp. W. Christ in the Philologus XVIII p. 112 sqq.

35. The Romans were naturally well-qualified for eloquence by their acute intellect, love of order and their Italian vivacity, tempered with Roman gravity. The influence of habit and rule, the publicity of all transactions, the numerous occasions where good speaking was required, before the people, the senate, a jury or magistrates, the army or at a funeral, caused fluent speaking to become a necessary requisite in the state, and the possession of eloquence a means to attain political distinction, especially when the privileges of rank disappeared one after the other, and political party-strife became more frequent and ardent. In consequence of this, eloquence took from the beginning a practical direction, and practice in public speaking became an essential part of the education of a young Roman, so much so that Cato the Elder already composed a manual of it, and in several families, as in that of the Scribonii, eloquence became hereditary through several generations. To this must be attributed the large numbers of orators among the Romans, the early commencement of eloquence and the great perfection to which it attained, its rise and decay with the various phases of the political constitution.

1. Cic. off. II 19, 66: huic (eloquentiae) a maioribus nostris est in toga dignitatis principatus datus. Brut. 49, 182: .. in tanta et tam vetere republica, maximis praemiis eloquentiae propositis, omnes cupisse dicere, non plurimos ausos esse, potuisse paucos. Liv. XXXIX 40: ad summos honores alios scientia iuris, alios eloquentia, alios gloria militaris provexit. Quintil. II 16, 8: pop. rom., apud quem summa semper oratoribus dignitas fuit. Tac. dial. 37: .. procerum manum multum in his studiis operae curaeque posuisse nec quemquam illis temporibus magnam potentiam sine aliqua eloquentia consecutum.

2. Cic. de or. II 13, 55: nemo studet eloquentiae nostrorum hominum nisi ut in causis atque in foro eluceat: apud Graccos etc. (eloquence was the purpose by itself). The moral part even suffered by the regard paid to the practical side: the solicitor was scarcely expected to adhere to truth. Cicero's words about Mark Antony (Brut. 207) that he was facilis in causis recipiendis, apply also to himself, and in more than one passage he teaches that for an orator not the verum is the aim, but the verisimile; see de or. II 59, 241. off. II 14, 51. In a similar manner Quintilian II 15, 32. III 8, 13. XII 1, 33 sqq. 112, 5: ubi animis iudicum vis afferenda est et ab ipsa veri contemplatione abducenda mens, ibi proprium oratoris opus est. On the other hand XII 7, 7: non convenit ei quem oratorem esse volumus iniusta tueri scientem; comp. IV 2, 93.

3. They commenced in early youth. Africanus minor says at the age of 18 years in Polyb. XXXII 9: *δοκῶ εἶναι πᾶσιν ἡσύχιός τις . . καὶ πολὺ κεχωρισμένος τῆς ῥωμαϊκῆς αἱρέσεως καὶ πράξεως ὅτι χρίσεις οὐχ αἱροῦμαι λέγειν.* Very frequently their début was a speech in praise of a recently departed relative. Even Augustus duodecimum annum agens aviam Iuliam defunctam pro contione laudavit (Suet. Aug. 8). The youthful character of such laudationes funebres was, therefore, perhaps a reason for their rarely being published: E. Hübner in the Hermes I p. 441. It was also very common to commence the career of orator by accusations: see Polyb. XXXII 15 in fin. Cic. Off. II 14, 49. Val. Max. V 4, 4. Quintil. XII 6, 1. Tac. dial. 34 in f. Apulei. apol. 66.

4. The speeches attributed by later historians to the regal period do not, of course, prove anything as to the eloquence of that time; but even then the constitution necessitated a certain amount of political speaking. In the year 870 v.c. Livy (VI 20) lets M. Manlius defend himself pro fastigio rerum oratione etiam magnifica. Meyer's collection from Appius Claudius to Symmachus amounts to 158 orators, without counting those whose speeches were never written down or of whom nothing is at least handed down to this purport.

5. The principal sources are Cicero's Brutus, Seneca the rhetor, Tacitus' dialogus, Quintilian X 1, 105—122 and XII 10, 10—12, also Pliny's letters. Oratorum romanorum fragmenta collegit H. Meyer, Zürich 1832. (Paris reprint 1837.) 1842. — A. Westermann, History of Roman eloquence, Leipzig 1835. F. Ellendt, succincta eloquentiae rom. usque ad Caesares historia, in his edition of Cic.'s Brutus. See also Mommsen II[2] p. 455. III p. 596 sq.

36. The eloquence of the oldest period was thoroughly natural, the artless expression of an individual excited by a certain situation and certain purposes, possessing political importance and able to speak. But as early as the close of the 5th century Appius Claudius published his speech after it was delivered

and of the funeral speeches mentioned in the 6th century it is possible that they were written down from the very beginning. The undoubtedly greatest orator of the 6th century, Cato the Elder, must generally have written down and published his speeches as political pamphlets, though perhaps only after they were delivered. On the whole in the 6th century v. c. the spoken word was as yet the most important; writing down and publishing speeches was resorted to for political purposes. Besides those of Cato, we hear in this time of published speeches esp. by the elder Africanus, L. Papirius and C. Titius. In the beginning of the sixth century Roman eloquence was already so far advanced that the acquaintance with Greek rhetoric only raised it and made it more conscious of its worth, without depriving it of its national character. The first to attempt an artistic disposition in his speeches was Ser. Sulpicius Galba (cos. 610), and Gracchus the younger was a perfect orator on account of his combination of talent and study. It was the exception, even in the first half of that century, if an orator published none of his speeches, and there were already writers who composed speeches afterwards spoken by others. In the epoch of the Gracchi, practical political speaking had attained to its highest perfection, and maintained itself so during 30 or 40 years. But by and by, when the orator no longer addressed the sovereign People, but a plebeian mob, studied perfection was regarded as less important in a spoken speech. Political purposes became then more insignificant in published speeches: speeches were composed and published as mere specimens of eloquence. The most eminent orators of this time were M. Antonius (Cons. 655) and L. Crassus (Cons. 659); but besides them we find a large number of orators remarkable in their way, e. g. Q. Lutatius Catulus, Q. Mucius Scaevola (Cons. 659), L. Marcius Philippus (Cons. 663), L. Apuleius Saturninus (654), M. Livius Drusus (663), C. Julius Caesar Strabo (aedilis 664), P. Sulpicius Rufus (666), C. Aurelius Cotta (Cons. 679). Without ever losing sight of their practical purposes, the orators and theorists of the Roman school (as e. g. in Sulla's time the Rhetoric addressed to Herennius), kept aloof from the crotchets of the Greek rhetoricians, though they also knew how to appreciate the instruction derived from the Greeks. In the second half of the 7th century men of Roman birth com-

menced to give rhetorical instruction in Latin. Through the medium of the Greeks, the exaggerated style then prevailing in Asia was introduced in Rome, and found a representative especially in Hortensius. But his younger contemporary, Cicero, again deserted this style, and joined a mediating school, the Rhodian; by a happy combination of talents, exercised and ennobled by indefatigable industry, he was lifted to the highest place in the artistic eloquence of the Romans. He gained also merit by making the principal doctrines of rhetoric popular among his countrymen. In the later years of his life arose a school that found even him too Asiatic: a number of young men, to whom even Caesar seems to have belonged, made it their principle to revert to the genuine old Attic orators, and the majority even chose as their pattern the simplest writer among them, viz. Lysias. To this school belong M. Brutus, Licinius Calvus, Caelius Rufus, Q. Cornificius, M. Calidius and later Asinius Pollio and M. Messala, the first of whom admired especially Thucydides, the latter Hyperides. Frequently as speeches were published, it was even then very rare that the spoken and the published speech agreed throughout, since the orators would prepare their speeches without ever writing them down elaborately.

1. Cato: orator est, Marce fili, vir bonus dicendi peritus; see Sen. Controv. praef. 9, p. 49, 17 Bu. Comp. Quintil. XII 1, sqq.

2. To the most ancient orators belong P. Licinius Crassus (Cons. 549) and M. Cornelius Cethegus (Cons. 550). Published funeral speeches are mentioned of Q. Caecilius Metellus on his father Lucius (a. 533), of Fabius Cunctator on his son (later than 541), of M. Claudius Marcellus on his father (546); a speech in the senate by Q. Metellus (553) and L. Papirius of Fregellae (circa 580); the defence of the elder Africanus (569), and a speech before the people of C. Titius (593). See below § 112 and 113. The funeral speech on the younger Africanus (625) existed likewise as a publication, see 127, 2. It is possible that these publications had also some political purpose.

3. Quintil. III 1, 19: Romanorum primus, quantum ego quidem sciam, condidit aliqua in hanc materiam (the theory of eloquence) M. Cato ille Censorius (in his praecepta). post M. Antonius inchoavit. But for a long time afterwards self-taught orators are mentioned, e. g. of Curio (Cons. 678) Cicero says (Brut. 59, 214): nullum ille poetam noverat, nullum legerat oratorem, nullam memoriam antiquitatis collegerat; non publicum ius, non privatum et civile cognoverat. quamquam hoc quidem fuit etiam in aliis — et magnis quidem —, oratoribus, . . ut

Sulpicio, ut Antonio. But cases of this kind were then only exceptional, and it is wrong when Aper (in Tac. dial. 19) says of the orators of the period of Cicero: paucissimi praecepta rhetorum aut philosophorum placita (the latter might rather be right) cognoverant.

4. Cic. de or. II 22, 92: nostri oratores .. scripta ex quibus iudicium fieri posset non multa sane reliquerunt. This is meant in comparison with the Greeks. Cic. himself mentions Greek speeches of the two Gracchi (Brut. 104. 117), M. Aemilius Scaurus (ib. 112), P. Rutilius Rufus (114), the son of the younger Africanus (77), Q. Tubero (117), Curio (122) and his son (220), Sulpicius Galba (127), Flavius Fimbria (129), T. Albucius (131), Q. Lutatius Catulus (132), Q. Scaevola (163), Caesar (262); besides Quintil. X 1, 116 of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, Asconius Cornel. p. 934 Or. of Cominius. Comp. Cic. p. Cluent. 50, 140: M. Antonium aiunt solitum esse dicere, idcirco se nullam umquam orationem scripsisse, ut, si quid aliquando non opus esset ab se esse dictum, posset negare dixisse. Extra urbem, too, apud socios et Latinos, existed orators and speeches published by them (Cic. Brut. 169 sq.), e. g. L. Papirius of Fregellae and (circa 650) T. Betutius of Asculum.

5. Cato the Elder and even (C.) Gracchus commenced all their speeches with a prayer to or at least some mention of the Gods, Serv. on Virg. Ae. VII 259. XI 301. Gell. XIII 23 (22), 1 (in plerisque antiquis orationibus). The general manner in which this is related of Cato's speeches leads to the supposition that this holds good of those also which he held in civil causes (causae privatae), the only ones of the kind before the time of Cicero of which we know that they were published, just as in Cicero's own time only a few civil ones delivered before the tribunal of the centum viri are known to us. H. Jordan, Caton. quae extant, p. LXXXVII.

6. L. Aelius Stilo .. scriptitavit orationes multis, orator ipse numquam fuit, Cic. Brut. 169, comp. 205 sq. M. Bibulus scriptitavit accurate, cum praesertim non esset orator, ib. 267. Plotius Gallus dictavit Atratino (the accuser) actionem, Suet. rhet. 2. In this manner C. Caelius for Tubero (Cic. de or. II 84, 341), Laelius for Fabius Maximus (below 127, 2). Cicero himself composed in this manner speeches for Cn. Pompeius and T. Ampius (Quintil. III 8, 50) and (a. 700) for a father the funeral speech on his son Serranus (ad Q. fr. III 8, 5: laudavit pater scripto meo).

7. Cic. Brut. 96, 328: id declarat totidem quot dixit .. scripta verbis oratio. This was not, however, the usual thing, see ib. 24, 91: videmus alios oratores inertia nihil scripsisse, ne domesticus etiam labor accederet ad forensem; pleraeque enim scribuntur orationes habitae iam, non ut habeantur. Cf. ib. 93. Quintil. X 7, 30: plerumque multa agentibus accidit ut maxime necessaria et utique initia (of speeches) scribant, cetera quae domo afferunt cogitatione complectantur, subitis ex tempore occurrant, quod fecisse M. Tullium commentariis ipsius (see ib. IV 1, 69) apparet. Plin. Ep. I 20, 7: .. Ciceronis pro Murena,

pro Vareno (also p. Quintio), in quibus brevis et nuda quasi subscriptio quorundam criminum solis titulis indicatur, ex his apparet illum permulta dixisse, cum ederet omisisse. Similarly did L. Crassus (Cic. Brut. 160. 164). It is different with the speech for Milo and the second Philippic; Cato too had published speeches which had not been delivered (see below 108, 1). Speeches were in Cicero's time taken down by shorthand writers at the time of delivery, as e. g. the speech pro Milone. Suet. Caes. 55 says of Caesar's speech pro Q. Metello: non immerito Augustus existimat magis ab actuariis exceptam male subsequentibus verba dicentis quam ab ipso editam. Quintilian too complains (VII 2, 24) of the booksellers who published his speeches, neglegentia . . notariorum corruptae. On the other hand, M. Brutus e. g. composed only exercitationis gratia a speech in defence of Milo (Quintil. III 6, 93, comp. X 1, 23). Suppositious speeches existed at an early date. Sulpici (tr. pl. 666) orationes quae feruntur, eas post mortem eius scripsisse P. Canutius putatur. . . . ipsius Sulpici nulla oratio est. Cic. Brut. 205.

8. Hieronym. ad Euseb. Chr. a. 1929 = Ol. 173, 1 = 667 v. c.: Plotius Gallus primus Romae latinam rhetoricam docuit. Comp. Suet. rhet. 2. Sen. controv. II 8, 5. p. 116, 22 sq. Bu. Quintil. II 4, 42. The expulsion of the latini rhetores in the year 662 by the Censors, among whom was L. Crassus (Gell. XV 11, 2) had no lasting effect. Hieron. l. l. 1936 = Ol. 174, 4 = 673: Vultacilius Plotus latinus rhetor, Cn. Pompei libertus et doctor, scholam Romae aperuit. Greek masters of eloquence in the time of Cicero were Hermagoras the Elder, Molon, Apollodorus of Pergamon. Their pupils: Apollodori praecepta magis ex discipulis cognoscas, quorum diligentissimus in tradendo fuit latine G. Valgius, graece Atticus: Quintil. III 1, 18. Cf. Hieronym. l. l. 1953 = Ol. 179, 1 = 690: Apollodorus Pergamenus, graecus orator, praeceptor Calidii et Augusti, clarus habetur. Cic. Brut. 263: C. Sicinius, ex disciplina Hermagorae; so also T. Accius of Pisaurum, ib. 271. A pupil of Molon was also T. Torquatus, Brut. 245.

9. The characteristic features of the principal orators of the Ciceronian period are thus summed up by Quintil. XII 10, 11: vim Caesaris, indolem Caelii, subtilitatem Calidii, diligentiam Pollionis, dignitatem Messalae, sanctitatem Calvi, gravitatem Bruti, acumen Sulpici, acerbitatem Cassii reperimus. Comp. Apul. apol. 95: ut in illa (oratione) neque Cato gravitatem requirat, neque Laelius lenitatem, neque Gracchus impetum, nec Caesar calorem, nec Hortensius distributionem, nec Calvus argutias, nec parsimoniam Sallustius, nec opulentiam Cicero.

37. The Augustan age possesses in Asinius Pollio and M. Messala late representatives of Republican eloquence, and Augustus himself as well as Agrippa and Maecenas show themselves, whenever occasion requires, men of oratorical training. But in this period, in connection with the downfall of the old constitution, the opportunities and subjects of eloquence

disappear, while the impediments and barriers increase in proportion. Mere theory daily encroaches on the place of practice, rhetors supplant the orators, declaiming supersedes speaking. In Augustus' own time appear, therefore, the earliest representatives of Imperial eloquence: the orator Cassius Severus, the rhetors Porcius Latro, Albucius Silus, Arellius Fuscus, Junius Gallio, Cestius Pius, Fulvius Sparsus, Argentarius, Blandus, Q. Haterius, Julius Bassus, Pompeius Silo, Varius Geminus, and others, to whom may be added Rutilius Lupus and Seneca rhetor in the last years of Augustus. The main features of this new eloquence are the exclusive cultivation of style and an intentional renunciation of serious subjects and practical purposes. The rhetor's school becomes now a purpose by itself and a centre of intellectual life where a world of fictions grows up, mostly drawn from Greek predecessors. From the genus deliberativum its suasoriae are taken, from the g. iudiciale its controversiae; in the class of epideictic compositions the laudationes and vituperationes are much liked. The habits of the rhetorical lecture-rooms are then also transferred to the few occasions of practical display, employed as they were for the exhibition of theatrical declamation. Legal knowledge was very scarce. The most eminent orators of this kind in the post-Augustan age are Votienus Montanus, Pomanius Hispo, Crispus Passienus Domitius Afer, Galerius Trachalus, Julius Africanus, Vibius Crispus, Julius Secundus, and finally Tacitus and Pliny. It is in vain that Quintilian and Tacitus (in the dialogue) point to the genuine classical authorities and struggle against the fashion of their time, though they themselves are unwittingly under its influence. In Fronto's time, the style became besides turgid and inelegantly decked out with archaisms. Apuleius has the same mannerism, but more talent. The more manysided and intricate the Roman Law became, espec. in the third century, the more inaccessible did it become to these phraseologists, who in this way also lost the last remnant of practical utility and were henceforth limited to epideictic speeches, to servile panegyrics, declamations on fictitious subjects, and to epistolary composition. Gaul was more fertile in these than the other parts of the Empire. The most distinguished representative of this school is Symmachus, and afterwards Ausonius; the panegyric orators

Claudius Mamertinus, Eumenius, Nazarius and Drepanius are all the more shallow. In the sixth century we have in this class Eunodius, partly also Boethius and Cassiodorus. The African rhetors were richer in thought but less careful in style; among them Christianity found, in the 3rd and 4th centuries, its most ingenious defenders (Tertullian, Arnobius, Cyprian, St. Augustin). The rhetoricians of these centuries devoted their attention to the study of the old masters and endeavoured to make them palatable to their contemporaries by diluting them in their fashion.

1. Tac. dial. 38 extr.: (orationes) mediis D. Augusti temporibus habitae, postquam longa temporum quies et continuum populi otium et assidua senatus tranquillitas et maxime principis disciplina ipsam quoque eloquentiam, sicut omnia, pacaverat. Rhetoric was in that period taught at Rome by the Greeks Theodorus of Gadara and Caecilius of Acte, and by the Roman knight Blandus. Sen. Controv. II praef. 2, p. 116, 19 sqq. Bu.: Blandus rhetor, qui eques rom. Romae docuit. ante illum intra libertinos praeceptores pulcherrimae disciplinae continebantur et .. turpe erat docere (for payment) quod honestum erat discere. This too shows the increased importance of rhetoric.

2. Tac. dial. 14 extr.: novi rhetores, veteres oratores. At least 100 such novi are mentioned by Seneca the Elder. Later ones also in Juv. VII 143 sqq. 214. Nero was the first Emperor of the Julian dynasty who required alienam facundiam, Tac. A. XIII 3. The principal orators of his own time are thus characterised by Quintil. XII 10, 11: copiam Senecae, vires Africani, maturitatem Afri, iucunditatem Crispi, sonum Trachali, elegantiam Secundi. Latin writers on rhetoric in the first century (besides Seneca and Quintilian) are Celsus, Laenas, Luranius (Quint. IX 4, 38), Stertinius, Gallio, Porcius Latro, Cestius Pius, Plinius Secundus (Quint. XI 3, 143), Verginius, Tutilius, Vettius (Juv. VII 150 sp.). Cf. Quint. III 1, 19—21. Quintilian was the first professor of eloquence appointed by the state (by Vespasian). In this time already Juv. VIII 147 sq. says: accipiat te Gallia, vel potius nutricula causidicorum Africa, si placuit mercedem ponere linguae.

3. The causae corruptae eloquentiae, which Tacitus (dial.) and Quintilian (see V 12, 23. VI prooem. 3. VIII 6, 76) attempted to point out in special treatises, consisted not only in the licentia atque inscitia declamantium (Quint. II 10, 3), but this was only one of the symptoms, and the real causes are to be found in the state of the time. The public were not better than their orators and required always something new and startling: Tac. dial. 19. Quint. IV 1, 57. 72. 5, 10. 8, 1. Nor where those who vividam et incorruptam eloquentiam tuendis civibus exercebant (Tac. A. XIII 42), i. e. the judicial speakers, causidici, any better than the rhetoricians, rather in ipsa capitis aut fortunarum pericula irrupit voluptas (Quint. IV 2, 122 comp. 127. 3, 2. Pers.

I 83 sqq. Mart. VI 19). As to legal technicalities, most of these pleaders, not having any knowledge of their own, were obliged to consult pragmatici as monitores, Quint. XII 3, 2 sqq. Juv. VII 123.

4. On the practices of rhetorical schools see Quint. X 3, 21: obstant fere turba discipulorum et consuetudo classium certis diebus audiendarum, nonnihil etiam persuasio patrum numerantium potius declamationes quam aestimantium. On the unpractical themes foreign to real life (as of abdicati, of a raptor, Juv. VII 168) see Quint. II 10, 5. VIII 3, 23, and in other places. A favourite theme was thundering against tyrants (Juv. VII 151), and (in history) Sulla (ib. I 16 sq.) and Hannibal (VII 161 sqq.). There are works on scholastic compositions of this kind by Quintilian and Calpurnius Flaccus, especially important are Seneca the Elder and Philostratus' Vitae Sophistarum. The declamation was exaggerated, vivid and rich in gesticulation, Quint. II 12, 9 sq. IV 2, 37. 39. XI 3, 184. The habit of applauding, Quint. II 2, 9 sqq.

5. In the 3rd century Lamprid. Diad. 4, 2: solent pueri pileo insigniri naturali (a caul), quod obstetrices rapiunt et advocatis credulis vendunt, siquidem causidici hoc iuvari dicuntur. Alex. Sev. 35, 1 sqq.: oratores et poetas non sibi panegyricos dicentes, quod . . stultum ducebat, sed aut orationes recitantes aut facta veterum canentes libenter audivit . . ad Athenaeum audiendorum et graecorum et latinorum rhetorum vel poetarum causa frequenter processit. audivit etiam forenses oratores causas recitantes quas vel apud ipsum vel apud praefectos urbis egerunt. 44, 4 sq.: rhetoribus, grammaticis, medicis etc. salaria instituit et auditoria decrevit et discipulos cum annonis . . dari iussit. etiam in provinciis oratoribus forensibus multum detulit, plerisque etiam annonas dedit, quos constitisset gratis agere. Ib. 68, 1 Claudius Venacus, orator amplissimus. Cf. Capitol. Maximin. 29 (iun. 3) 4: Messalam ex familia nobili, oratorem potentissimum eundemque doctissimum. Maximinus the younger's teacher was orator Titianus, ib. 27 (iun. 1), 5. In the reign of Gordianus III Misitheus, doctissimus vir, quem causa eloquentiae dignum parentela sua putavit (Capit. Gord. 23, 6). With regard to Numerianus Vopiscus Car. 11, 1 says: eloquentia praepollens, adeo ut publice declamaverit feranturque illius scripta nobilia, declamationi tamen magis quam Tulliano adcommodatiora stilo. From the senate he received a statue with the legend: Numeriano Caesari, oratori temporibus suis potentissimo (ib. 11, 3). Postumus the younger was, according to Trebell. Poll. XXX tyr. 4, 2 ita in declamationibus disertus ut eius controversiae Quintiliano dicantur insertae. M. Damatius Urbanus, optima facundia praeditus (in Sitifis, a. s. 231), Orelli-Henzen 5607. In this century lived the rhetor Aquila Romanus.

6. In the fourth century we may name, Ausonius' masters, Ti. Victor Minervius, his son Alethius Minervius, then Latinus Alcimus Alethius, the Emperor Julian's master, Aemilius Magnus Arborius, rhetor Tolosae, Auson. Profess. Burdig. 1. 6. 2. 16. — M. Romanius Iovinus, rhetor eloquii latini, Orelli-Henzen 5606 (Rome). — Subjects: panegyrici and fictae ludorum (schools) lites, Auson. l. l. 1, 13 sqq.

7. A collection of the later rhetorical treatises, down to Beda, by C. Halm: Rhetores latini minores. Ex codd. maximam partem primum adhibitis emendavit. Lips. 1863. It contains the scriptores de figuris sententiarum et elocutionis (espec. Rutilius Lupus, Aquila and Julius Rufinianus), the manual of rhetoric by Fortunatianus, Augustinus, Sulpicius Victor, Julius Severianus and Julius Victor, as well as the corresponding parts of the encyclopaedias of Martianus Capella, Cassiodorus and Isidorus; furthermore Albini (vulgo Alcuini) dialogus de rhetorica, and a number of writers on details of rhetoric, e. g. Priscian's translation of Hermagoras' *προγυμνάσματα*, treatises by Emporius, Rufinus etc.

38. Jurisprudence is the only part of literature which was developed by the Romans in a manner throughout national. An inflexible and unwavering adherence to their right was always peculiar to the Romans, and this favoured the growth and consolidation of a system of laws, for the development of which their eminent qualities of acute intellect, practical dexterity and love of order were perfectly sufficient, and which was also favoured by the combination of conservatism and progress peculiar to the Roman law. There were fixed rules at a very early date, espec. of a religious character and in the possession of the patrician Pontifices, whence also their interpretation, application and development lay in the hands of the patricians. But when (c. 450 v. c.) the various forms of accusations and a list of judgment-days had been made public, the Law became generally accessible and was almost immediately represented by the Plebeians P. Sempronius Sophus and Tib. Coruncanius. The law being of a very positive character, literary activity could at first manifest itself only in collecting and interpreting the sources; so it was in the first juridical writer, Sex. Aelius Catus (c. 550). The more varied life became, the more important grew the knowledge of the law, and the auctoritas prudentum as laid down in their advices (responsa), gradually became an acknowledged source of law. Since the beginning of the 7th century V. C. we find the responsa written down and published in collections, as e. g. by the son of Cato Censorius, by M. Junius Brutus and P. Mucius Scaevola (Cons. 621), while M'. Manilius published a collection of formulas. As early as the middle of the 7th century, most probably under the influence of the Stoic philosophy, the Roman Law was reduced to a system by Q. Mucius Scaevola (pont. max., Cons. 659). His pupil was C. Aquilius Gallus,

and through the pupil of the latter, Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, the systematic development of the Law was greatly advanced, Cicero also contributing to it. Until then, legal knowledge had principally been propagated by oral tradition, and in some families (as e. g. the Aelii, Mucii, Porcii, Sulpicii, later on the Antistii) been quasi-hereditary, a circumstance which did much to create a special profession of jurists.

1. Sources: Pomponius de origine iuris, Dig. I 2. Later on the Digest in general. Collections by Gneist (Institutionum syntagma, Lips. 1858) and by Ph. E. Huschke (Iurisprudentiae anteiustinianeae quae supersunt, Lips. 1861. 1867) and the Corpus iuris anteiustinianei, Bonn 1835 sqq.

2. J. A. Bach, historia iurisprudentiae romanae, Lips. 1754 sqq. editio sexta, ed. A. C. Stockmann, Lips. 1806. S. W. Zimmern, History of the Civil Law of the Romans until Justinian, espec. I 1 (Heidelberg 1826). A. F. Rudorff, History of Roman Law, Leipzig 1857, espec. I: The formation of the Law. See also the handbooks of the Institutions, espec. that of Puchta, Vol. I. F. D. Sanio, on the history of Roman Jurisprudence, Königsberg 1858, and: An attempt to trace Varroniana in the writings of the Roman jurists, espec. in Pomponius' Enchiridion, Leipzig 1867. Mommsen H. of Rome I³ p. 406, n. 2. 441 sq. II p. 458—460. — H. E. Dirksen, Fragments from the writings of the Roman jurists, Königsberg 1814. On the oldest jurists see also de Geer, Verslagen etc. of the Dutch Academy, VII (1863) p. 196—209.

3. Among the Greeks legal training and knowledge were much neglected; see Cic. de or. I 45, 198. 59, 253. At Rome the circumstances were more favourable; comp. Ihering, Spirit of Roman Law I p. 300 sqq. Among them legal knowledge penetrated even to the people, comp. the formulas of sponsio in cattle-bargains in Cato (R. R. 144—150) and Varro (below 129, 1). The more national a poet is, the more prominent the position the law holds in his writings. So espec. in Plautus. But even Terence, Eun. prol. 10 sqq., thinks that a play of Luscius is condemned by proving a flagrant error in civil law in it. Comp. also the titles of togatae, Emancipatus, Iurisperita (perhaps also Icta); by Titinius and Afranius. It is a matter of course that business-men (e. g. M'. Curius, Cic. ad Fam. VII 29) possessed legal knowledge; later on we find the same related of several ladies, Juv. VI 244 sq. — Cic. Off. II 19, 65: in iure cavere, consilio iuvare atque hoc scientiae genere prodesse quam plurimis vehementer et ad opes augendas pertinet et ad gratiam itaque cum multa praeclara maiorum tum quod optime constituti iuris civilis summo semper in honore fuit cognitio atque interpretatio. Liv. XXXIX 40: ad summos honores alios scientia iuris . . provexit.

4. Clients are said to consulere, but the consulti (de iure) respondent (Cic. Brut. 30, 113), which they did either in their residence

(sitting on a solium, Cic. de or. II 55, 226. III 33, 133) or while they transverso foro ambulabant (ib. III 33, 133). A. F. Rudorff, On the origin of consultatio, in the Journal of Jurispr. XIII p. 50—66. By admitting younger men as listeners, pupils were trained, as was already the practice of Coruncanius. Cicero e. g. was the auditor of the augur Q. Scaevola, and he writes (ad Fam. VII 19) to Trebatius: num ius civile vestrum ex libris cognosci potest? qui quamquam plurimi sunt, doctorem tamen nonnumquam desiderant. Many formulas had to be learnt by heart, Cic. de or. I 58, 246.

5. The schematic arrangement of the Stoic philosophy necessarily influenced the jurists. The augur Q. Scaevola was in friendly intercourse with Panaetius (Cic. de or. I 11, 45), and the pontifex Q. Scaevola shows the influence of the Stoics in his threefold division of the doctrine of the Gods (August. civ. d. IV 27) and in the title of a work, Ὅροι. Later on, the influence of Aristotle and the Stoics showed itself espec. in the view taken of the Law of Nature, as φύσει δίκαιον. M. Voigt, the ius naturale I. Leipzig 1856. Hildenbrand, The philosophy of law and polity, I p. 593 sqq. Laferrière, Mém. concernant l'influence du stoicisme sur la doctrine des Jurisconsultes romains, Mém. de l'acad. des sciences morales X (1860) p. 579—685. Cic. ad Fam. VII 12 considers jurisprudence unable to agree with the Epicurean system.

39. As the main department of Roman jurisprudence, Civil Law, was nearly independent of the Constitution of the State, the change of this did not impede its development, but rather the monarchic concentration of legislation and judicature required technical advisers and interpreters all the more urgently. The Augustan age possessed in C. Trebatius Testa, A. Cascellius, and Q. Tubero excellent jurists; under the latter the division of the jurisprudents into Sabinians and Proculians commenced; at the head of the first was the yielding C. Ateius Capito, while the Proculians were headed by the republican M. Antistius Labeo. Augustus already gave to the responsa in part legal authority. Under the following Emperors of the Julian dynasty flourished the jurists Masurius Sabinus, M. Cocceius Nerva, C. Cassius Longinus and Sempronius Proculus. Indispensable to the Emperors and undisturbed in their civil law even in the worst periods, occupying, moreover, the highest places in the State, the profession of the jurists was continually recruited by talented and principled men by whose labours jurisprudence was developed to a minuteness unattainable to non-professionals and who imparted to the law evenness and logical sequence. Though even

under the Flavian dynasty (Nerva fil., Caelius Sabinus, Pegasus, Juventius Celsus, the father), and under Nerva and Trajan (Celsus fil., Neratius Priscus, Priscus Javolenus, Titius Aristo) the number of eminent lawyers and professors of jurisprudence was very large, we find espec. after Hadrian, c. 130 until 230 A. D., a continuous series of eminent jurists: Salvius Julianus, L. Volusius Maecianus, Sex. Pomponius, L. Ulpius Marcellus, Q. Cervidius Scaevola, and more especially the coryphees and classic authors of jurisprudence: Gaius, Aemilius Papinianus, Julius Paullus, Domitius Ulpianus, and Herennius Modestinus. Intellects of this excellence raised jurisprudence to a height compared with which all the labours of the Republican period appear like crude attempts; they imparted to their writings the distinctness, nay beauty of scientific works of art, and transformed the Roman Law, formerly the Law of a City, to a Law applicable to all humanity, almost without national pecularities, and in which legal ideas have found their most distinct expression, and which has been the protection of injured men on account of the sentiments of humanity pervading it. Many traits originally harsh and severe, they knew how to soften down or change by explanation, though this also taught them to turn the expressions into meanings not originally belonging to them. About the middle of the 3rd century after Christ the productive power of jurisprudence ceased. In the 4th century the collection of the Imperial decrees was commenced in the codex Gregorianus (a. 308), which was soon followed by the codex Hermogenianus (365). Under Theodosius II and Valentinian III the Roman Law of the Christian period began to be systematised, in the codex Theodosianus, which received legal authority a. 438 and was augmented between 448 and 468 by the novellae of Theodosius and his successors. In the fifth century we have the fragmenta Vaticana and the Collatio legum mosaicarum et romanarum; in the beginning of the 6th century the Edictum Theodorici, the lex romana Visigothorum (breviarium Alaricianum) and the lex romana Burgundionum. All these labours were concluded by the collection of legal documents commanded by Justinian and executed espec. by Tribonianus; first (529) the Codex Iustinianeus, then (533) the Institutiones and Digest, a selection from the works of the principal jurists in 50 books, then (534) an enlarged

edition of the Codex (repetitae praelectionis). The (168) Novellae constitutiones Iustiniani date from 535—565, but are merely a private collection made after Justinian's death; another (of 125 Novellae) the Epitome Iuliani, was made 556. Later on, a third collection followed, of 134 Novellae, called Authenticum in the middle ages.

1. Popular notions of the jurist's task: qui iuris nodos et legum aenigmata solvit, Juv. VIII 58. Iurisconsulti, quorum summus circa verborum proprietatem labor est, Quintil. V 14, 34. In reality the criminal law was far less developed than civil law. Even in the Imperial period a certain knowledge of law was for some time general; in Apulej. Met. IX 27 a common man says: non herciscundae familiae, sed communi dividundo formula dimicabo. See also an inscription in the via Appia (Orelli 5069): Iter privatum Anni Largi. precario utitur. Antonius Astralis (lest a servitus might arise). On the other hand we find the people scoffing at the exaggerated exactness (nimia et misera diligentia, Dig. II 31, 88. § 17) of the jurists, as e. g. in sepulchral inscriptions: huic monumento dolus malus abesto et iurisconsultus (or ius civile), Orelli 4374. 4390 f. 4821. Ib. 7236 a librarius is praised qui testamenta scripsit annos XIV sine iuris consulto. The will of a pig (above 24, 4) should also be mentioned here, though it may probably have originated in juridical circles.

2. The praefectus urbi was a jurist, and jurists composed the Imperial edicts (constitutiones). Capitol. Ant. Philos. 11, 10: habuit secum praefectos, quorum et auctoritate et periculo semper iura dictavit. usus autem est Scaevola praecipue iuris perito. Lamprid. Alex. Sev. 16, 1: neque ullam constitutionem sacravit sine XX iurisperitis et doctissimis ac sapientibus viris isdemque disertissimis non minus L. But this number was not the usual one. The official position of the jurists obtained for them the reputation that they had principally eyes for the interests of the treasury (Juv. IV 53 sqq.); but the most distinguished of them, Labeo, Cassius (Tac. A. XIV 43), Papinian (Spartian. Carac. 8) were far from servile, and Salvius Julianus' renown benefited even his great-grandson (Spart. Did. Iul. 1).

3. Quintilian (XII 3) expressly defends the necessity of legal knowledge in orators and assures them (ib. 6 cf. 9) that the law is non tam arduum quam procul intuentibus fortasse videatur, but also speaks against the jurists who despise eloquence and se ad album ac rubricas transtulerunt et formularii vel .. leguleii esse maluerunt. As a rule the orators understood nothing of the law (comp. above 37, 3) which was so difficult to handle in their phraseology, and in their arrogance they even thought that they could afford to make free with it (Tac. dial., 32). The causidici and iuridici are contrasted in Seneca apocol. 12. But for all that, legal knowledge and eloquence were always conceived as in some way connected; comp. Lamprid. Alex. Sev. 16, 2: si de iure aut de negotiis tractabat solos doctos et disertos adhibebat.

4. The general ignorance of the republican time in the Imperial period extended also to the jurists .. the iuris auctores of the republic were soon denoted as veteres and forgotten. Celsus is the last who seems to have himself used the writings of the veteres anterior to Q. Mucius Scaevola. The writings of the veteres after Q. Scaevola were in all probability no longer used in the originals by Pomponius and his contemporaries, and hence Pomponius commits several errors in his survey of the old period: see below 114, 3. 129, 2. 4 and 5.

5. H. E. Dirksen, on the evidence of the Inscriptions concerning .. several Roman jurists, Trans. of the Berlin Academy 1852, p. 105—208. H. H. Fitting, on the age of the writings of Roman jurists from Hadrian to Alexander Severus, Basle 1860. pp. 55. 4°. A confused list of jurists said to have lived under Al. Severus in Lampridius Al. Sev. 68.

40. The Romans as a nation had not much talent for the study of Philosophy. It is true, they did not lack the inclination to sum up general results from the scattered experience of life; but abstract reflexion seemed to their simple practical turn of mind little better than idling. All real philosophy they obtained from the Greeks, and this at a time when in Greece itself the great masters had been succeeded by Epigoni who confined themselves to reproducing and spinning out in the traditional manner a limited stock of ideas. The first transplanter of Greek philosophical thought, Q. Ennius, side by side with the practical wisdom of his Epicharmus, even translated a production of the most shallow rationalism, the work of Euhemerus, and this note reverberates in Pacuvius and L. Attius. The disagreement of doctrines of this kind with the existing customs and religion caused, a. 581, the expulsion of the Epicurean philosophers Alcaeus and Philiscus, and 599 = 155 the hasty but still late departure of the Athenian ambassadors, the Academician Carneades, the Stoic Diogenes, and the Peripatetic Critolaus, of whom the first especially made a deep impression on the younger generation by his eloquence and liberal sentiments. The far-seeing Stoic Panaetius was not long afterwards received by Scipio the younger and through him Stoicism gained admittance among the Romans. It was professed by Laelius the younger, Q. Aelius Tubero, C. Fannius, Sp. Mummius, C. Blossius, P. Rutilius Rufus, Valerius Soranus, L. Aelius Stilo, by the jurisprudents Q. Mucius Scaevola (the augur as well as the pontifex), L. Lucilius Balbus, Sex. Pompeius and Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, and finally Cato the younger; and in literature

by Stertinius. Other Romans were won over to other systems by the Greeks into whose hands they chanced to fall; the (new) Academy especially found many adherents, on account of its plausible doctrines and its consequent utility for legal purposes, e. g. C. Aurelius Cotta (Cons. 679), L. Lucullus, L. Tubero. M. Piso (Cons. 693) and M. Licinius Crassus (Cons. 684) inclined to the Peripatetic philosophy. The laxity, moral expansiveness and self-sufficiency of the Epicurean philosophy recommended it especially to such natures as were glad to retire to leisure and quiet from the political agitations, e. g. in Cicero's time his friend Atticus, Papirius Paetus and M. Marius. For this very reason this system was also the first to be represented in Latin literature, not only by Ennius and the communis historia of Lutatius in the time before Cicero, but also by Rabirius, Catius and Amafinius, and especially by Lucretius. Other adherents of the Epicurean philosophy were L. Saufeius, L. Manlius Torquatus (Praetor 706), C. Velleius, Statilius, P. Volumnius, and to a certain extent also C. Cassius. Nigidius Figulus stands alone with his somewhat doubtful Pythagorean philosophy. Much greater was the number of those who, following the example of the most distinguished Greek philosophers of this period, e. g. Antiochus of Ascalon, combined several systems in a 'syncretistic' manner, as Varro the polyhistor sided with the Stoics in dialectics, theology and natural philosophy, with the Academy in Ethics; and M. Brutus who, on the other hand, was a Stoic in Ethics, and an Academician in all other respects. The eclectic tendency is espec. exhibited in the numerous philosophical writings of Cicero.

1. A survey in Cic. Tusc. IV 1—3, comp. de or. II 37. Acad. pr. II 2, 5. — Hepke, de philosophis qui Romae docuerunt usque ad Antoninos. Berlin 1842. E. Zeller in his history of Greek philosophy and in his lecture on Religion and Philosophy among the Romans, Berlin 1866 (in Virchow's series of popular lectures XXIV.) esp. p. 18 sqq. Mommsen H. of R. II³ p. 411—417. III³ p. 550. See also A. Stahr, Aristotle among the Romans, Leipzig 1834.

2. The reflective bent of the Romans is shown by Appius Caecus' didactic poem, by Cato the Elder, and the sententious character of their favourite dramatic literature. Their practical wisdom was apt to wear a fatalistic colouring: see L. Paullus in Liv. XLV 8 and Scipio Africanus in Cic. off. I 26, 90. Ennius' words are characteristic: philosophari est mihi necesse, at paucis, nam omnino haud

placet (Reliq. ed. Vahlen p. 145). The supposed compositions of Numa dug out in the year 573 V. C., containing scripta philosophiae Pythagoricae, were burnt, quia philosophice scripta essent, Plin. N. H. XIII 27. Cato the Elder was ὅλως φιλοσοφίᾳ προσκεχρουκώς (Plut. Cat. mai. 23). Cicero considers it his duty to justify his philosophical writings in almost every book of this kind, and he does so with especial candour Off. II 1, 2 sqq. Even Tacitus in his Agricola (Agr. 4) says se prima in iuventa studium philosophiae acrius, ultra quam concessum Romano ac senatori, hausisse. The Romans considered the study of philosophy conducive to the formation of character, instructive as to the moral duties of man, the things on whose possession his happiness depends, and the means of obtaining them (Zeller l. l. p. 19). Varro in this way alleged as causa philosophandi that man thereby becomes bonus et beatus, and Cornelius Nepos (in Lactant. Inst. III 15, 10) adduces against the study of philosophy: video magnam partem eorum qui in schola de pudore et continentia praecipiant argutissime, eosdem in omnium libidinum cupiditatibus vivere. And Pacuvius already (in Gell. XIII 8) had said: ego odi homines ignava opera et philosopha sententia. We must also keep in mind the general mediocrity of the Greeks to whom the Romans owed their philosophy. "Thus it came to pass that the Romans became in philosophy merely worse pupils of bad masters." Th. Mommsen.

3. The various philosophical systems with regard to their fitness for oratorical purposes are discussed by Quintil. XII 2, 24 sq. The Stoic philosophy appeared to be least available for them: Cic. de or. III 18, 66. fin. IV 28, 78 sq. Parad. praef. 2. Brut. 30, 114. 118 sqq. Quintil. X 1, 84, cf. XII 2, 25; though Cicero maintains of himself and Cato (of Utica): nos philosophiam veram illam et antiquam, quae quibusdam otii esse ac desidiae videtur, in forum atque in remp. atque in ipsam aciem paene deduximus; comp. Parad. praef. 1: animadverti saepe Catonem .., cum in senatu sententiam diceret, locos graves ex philosophia tractare abhorrentes ab hoc usu forensi et publico, sed dicendo consequi tamen ut illa etiam populo probabilia viderentur.

4. Cic. in Vatin. 6, 14: tu qui te Pythagoreum soles dicere et hominis doctissimi nomen tuis immanibus et barbaris moribus praetendere. But on account of this passage Vatinius cannot be numbered among the philosophers, any more than Caerellia on account of Cicero Att. XIII 21, 5: mirifice Caerellia, studio videlicet philosophiae flagrans, describit (libros meos) de tuis; istos ipsos de finibus habet; see ib. 22, 3.

41. Augustus intentionally favoured the study of philosophy and even himself wrote Hortationes ad philosophiam. Besides him we know, however, only T. Livius, Crispinus, and Sextius the Elder as philosophical writers in his time. But philosophical training was possessed by, and manifests itself in, almost all

the first writers of that period, e. g. Virgil, Horace and L. Varius. The Epicurean philosophy was most in harmony with the tendency of the times, calling up, as it did, in the more serious minds a feeling of sorrowing resignation. Even in the first century after Christ the Epicurean and Stoic philosophies remained the only systems represented at Rome, but then only few possessed that liberty and self-consciousness of mind which form the basis of the Epicurean philosophy; the majority turned to Stoic philosophy, some weakening it by omitting the ruggedness of its system and the crotchety doctrines on cosmology, as Seneca does, others, e. g. Sextius the younger, increasing its depth by adding to it theistic and Pythagorean ingredients. Men of the most decided characters, as Paetus, Thrasea, Helvidius, Priscus, and also the young Persius Flaccus, even augmented its ruggedness of doctrine and practice, and by endeavouring at the some time to resist the despotic government, made the Stoic system politically offensive. Others at least followed the fashion by keeping a philosopher and having discussions with him. Rome in this way was flooded with philosophers, many of whom by their personal want of character brought philosophy itself into contempt. Vespasianus appointed a public professor of philosophy, but Domitian banished (a. 92) the philosophers from the capital. In the second century also the Stoic system prevailed and was numerously represented in Rome, by Greeks as well as Romans, among the latter espec. by Junius Rusticus; with M. Aurelius the Stoic philosophy appeared even on the throne. Others endeavoured to make philosophy popular, by extending their public lectures to these subjects also, e. g. Apuleius. Many thought to increase their effect by a cloudy mysticism, arbitrarily styling itself Platonism, e. g. Taurus, Favorinus, and also Apuleius. The Neoplatonic philosophy of the 3rd century has no representative of note in Roman Literature. The ascendancy of the Christian religion in the 4th century drove those who did not go over to it to the renewed study of the treasures of the old Greek philosophy, which were made more accessible by revision and translation, as e. g. by Augustin before he became a Christian, and espec. by Boetius in the 6th century. By these labours they were transmitted to the nations of the West, whose mental food they formed during the middle ages.

1. L. Varus (Varius?) Epicureus, Caesaris (Augusti) amicus, Quintil. VI 3, 78. He and Virgil had Syron as their master. Horace ridicules in his earlier poems the absurdities of the Stoic philosophy, and professes Epicurean doctrines; in the later ones he does justice to the seriousness and depth of Stoicism. Liv. XLIII 13, 1: nihil deos portendere vulgo nunc credunt. Under Caligula *Πομπήιος, συγκλητικὸς μέν, τὰς ἀρχὰς δὲ διεληλυθὼς σχεδὸν πάσας, Ἐπικούρειος δὲ ἄλλως καὶ δι' αὐτὸ ἀπράγμονος ἐπιτηδευτὴς βίου*, Joseph. Antiq. XIX 1, 5. On many Epitaphs of the period this tendency manifests itself. The Sextii, father aud son, wrote in Greek, as well as Cornutus. L. Crassicius, the master of Julus Antonius, transiit ad Q. Sextii philosophi sectam (Suet. gramm. 18). The principal document of this mixture of Stoicism with Jewish-theistic and Pythagorean-ascetic as well as theosophic elements, characteristic of the intellectual fermentation of the period, is Sextius' collection of 429 sentences, which exists in Rufinus' Latin and in a Syriac version, while of the Greek original we have only extensive fragments. See M. Ott in the programs of Rottweil for 1861 and 1862.

2. In the first century even ladies dallied with philosophy: see L. Friedländer, History of Roman manners I[1] p. 292 sq., and of Nero Tacitus A. XIV 16 relates: etiam sapientiae doctoribus tempus impertiebat post epulas utque contraria adseverantium discordia frueretur. nec deerant qui ore voltuque tristi inter oblectamenta regia spectari cuperent. This tristitia belonged to the philosopher's costume, as well as his long beard and threadbare gown, which for the sake of producing an effect was adopted from the Cynics. Unfortunately the servile covetousness and moral despicability of very many individuals did not well agree with this spiritual appearance. Quintil. I. O. I. prooem. 15: voltum et tristitiam et dissentientem a ceteris habitum pessimis moribus (see instances in Juv. II 4 sqq. 65) praetendebant. XII 3, 12: alii pigritiae arrogantioris, qui subito fronte conficta immissaque barba .. paulum aliquid sederunt in scholis philosophantium, ut deinde in publico tristes, domi dissoluti captarent auctoritatem contemptu ceterorum. On this arrogance also V 11, 39: inferiora omnia praeceptis suis ac litteris (?) credunt. But the common run of orators sapientiae studium et praecepta prudentium penitus reformidant (Tac. dial. 32). Comp. also Quint. XI 1, 33: philosophiam ex professo, ut quidam faciunt, ostentantibus &c. ib. 35: at vir civilis vereque sapiens, qui se non otiosis disputationibus, sed administrationibus reip. dediderit, a qua longissime isti qui philosophi vocantur recesserunt. Similarly XII 2, 6 sq. cf. ib. 9: hanc artem superbo nomine et vitiis quorundam bona eius corrumpentium invisam. Popular quips: facilius inter philosophos quam inter horologia conveniet (Sen. apocol. 2, 3), and numquam philosophum audivit as a compliment. Similar attacks against the Greek philosophers at Rome occur, however, as early as Plautus: Curc. II 3, 9 sqq. and the same complaints recur in Gellius, e. g. VII (VI) 10, 5: nunc videre est philosophos ultro currere ut doceant ad fores iuvenum

divitum eosque ibi sedere atque opperiri prope ad meridiem, donec discipuli nocturnum omne vinum edormiant. XIII 8, 5: nihil fieri posse indignius neque intolerantius dicebat (Macedo, familiaris meus) quam quod homines ignavi ac desides, operti barba et pallio, mores et emolumenta philosophiae in linguae verborumque artes converterent et vitia facundissime accusarent intercutibus ipsi vitiis madentes. In the same period Apul. Flor. I 7, p. 118 Bip.: ne .. rudes, sordidi, imperiti pallio tenus philosophos imitarentur et disciplinam regalem, tam ad bene dicendum quam ad bene vivendum repertam, male dicendo (an ambiguous expression) et similiter vivendo contaminarent. — C. Martha, les moralistes sous l'empire romain .. philosophes et poètes, Paris 1865.

3. Capitol. M. Antonin. philos. 2, 7: usus est etiam Commodi magistro, .. Apollonio Chalcedonio stoico philosopho. 3, 2 sq.: audivit et Sextum Chaeronensem Plutarchi nepotem, Iunium Rusticum, Claudium Maximum et Cinnam Catulum, stoicos. Peripateticae vero studiosum audivit Claudium Severum et praecipue Iunium Rusticum, .. stoicae disciplinae peritissimum. L. Iunius Rusticus, philosophus stoicus, Orelli 1190. C. Tutilius Hostilianus, philosophus stoicus, domo Cortona, ib. 1191. C. Matrinius Valentius, philosophus epicureus, ib. 1192. Gaius Stallius .. ex Epicureio gaudivigente choro, ib. 1193. Ceionius Rufius Albinus v. c. Consul (A. D. 335), philosophus &c. ib. 3111.

42. The Romans did not know how to appreciate the high practical value of mathematics and astronomy, but looked upon these sciences as unprofitable studies. With the exception of a few amateurs, such as Sex. Pompeius and Sulpicius Gallus (Cens. 588), they confined themselves to the parts of practical utility, the lower kinds of computation and measuring, which latter branch they expanded for the purpose of making camps and distributing the allotments of ground (below 48). In all other respects the mathematics of the Romans were merely a shallow rendering of Greek works, espec. those of Nicomachus. Sulpicius Gallus studied astronomy as an amateur, Varro as a polyhistor, and Nigidius Figulus from mystic tendencies. In the Imperial period astrology prevailed. Under Tiberius, Manilius made it the subject of a didactic poem. In the third century of the Christian era Censorinus' treatise de die natali is of importance, in the fourth we have 8 books matheseos by Julius Firmicus Maternus, in the sixth Boetius' two books de institutione arithmetica.

1. A just appreciation of the importance of mathematical science was very scarce even among the Greeks: see Teuffel's note on Aristoph. Clouds 201. Even Plutarch. an seni 16, numbers the

γεωμέτραι and ἀριθμητικοὶ among the οὐ πρακτικὰς ἀλλὰ θεωρητικὰς τέχνας ἔχοντες. The Roman notion appears sufficiently from the meaning of mathematici as 'astrologi'. Their neglect of astronomy was in the republican time punished by the unceasing confusion of the calendar. In general Cic. Tusc. I 2, 5: nihil (apud Graecos) mathematicis illustrius: at nos metiendi ratiocinandique utilitate huius artis terminavimus modum. Arithmetic had also its place in the schools: see Hor. S. I 6, 72 sqq. Ep. I 1, 56. II 3, 325 sq. See in general M. Cantor, mathematical Contributions to civilisation (1863) p. 168—230.

2. Of importance as to the history of geometry among the Romans is Balbus' preface to his master and friend Celsus, Gromatici lat. I p. 90 sqq. Lachm. (c. 100 A. D.). Hence it appears that important details in the theory of triangles were then known. F. Hultsch, Philologus XXII p. 62.

43. The Romans felt no pure interest in the objects of nature around them; neither would they spend their time in taking an unprejudiced view of them nor had they sufficient courage to do so. Hence they were always behindhand in natural philosophy and dependent upon the Greeks. Zoology and botany especially, both brought to such high perfection by Aristotle and Theophrastus, became known at Rome only at a late date, and then were not much studied. They were mostly connected with agriculture, less frequently with medical art, a study neglected by the Roman physicians even more than other things. In the Augustan period Valgius Rufus and Aemilius Macer translated Alexandrine didactic poems on botanical and zoological subjects. In the Encyclopaedias of Celsus and Pliny the Elder natural Philosophy was also represented, and the Imperial time shows, at its commencement, a dilettanti bent towards it, by its fondness for combining moralising reflexions with natural phenomena. This appears e. g. from Seneca's Quaestiones naturales. The following centuries were satisfied with mere translations of the Greek works on this subject.

1. Plin. N. H. XXV 2 sq.: minus hoc (botany, pharmacology, toxicology &c.) quam par erat nostri celebravere ... primusque et diu solus idem ille M. Cato .. paucis dumtaxat attigit. .. Post eum unus illustrium tentavit C. Valgius .. imperfecto volumine ad Div. Augustum ... Antea condiderat solus apud nos .. Pompeius Lenaeus, Magni libertus. .. Pompeius .. transferre ea (Mithridates' prescriptions on poisons and antidotes) sermone nostro libertum suum Lenaeum, grammaticae artis, iussit. Pliny repeatedly (N. H. X 2. XIV 3 comp. Ind. auct. VIII) quotes zoological and botanical notices from Cornelius Valerianus (see also III 17), which bear, however, the stamp of anecdotes.

2. R. Albani, de historia naturali apud veteres, Dresden 1854. 40 pp. 8°. Ernst H. F. Meyer, History of botany, I (Königsberg 1854), espec. p. 334 sqq. II (1855) p. 1 sqq.

44. Agriculture was a subject of great interest to the Romans and besides their own experience they endeavoured also to utilise that of foreign nations. Thus e. g. the work on agriculture by the Carthaginian Mago was, by order of the Senate, translated into Latin, and the only extant work of Cato the Elder is the de re rustica. At the seventh century V. C. we find other writers on agriculture in Mamilius Sura, the two Sasernas (father & son), and Tremellius Scrofa, and by Varro the polyhistor we have also a work of this kind. Virgil's Georgics are a panegyric on this branch of human industry. In the same time Sabinus Tiro dedicated his work on horticulture to Maecenas, and the same subject was, in the 3rd century, treated by Gargilius Martialis. At the commencement of the Imperial period we possess Columella's work, and in the fourth century A. D. that of Palladius. Not long before Columella, Cornelius Celsus, Julius Atticus and Julius Graecinus had composed their works on agriculture. That of the brothers Quintilii seems to have been written in Greek towards the close of the 3rd century. The cookery-book which bears the name of Apicius was compiled about the middle of the 3rd century A. D. from Greek sources.

1. Colum. I 1, 12—14: ut agricolationem romana tandem civitate donemus, .. iam nunc M. Catonem Censorium illum memoremus, qui eam latine loqui primus instituit; post hunc duos Sasernas, patrem et filium, qui eam diligentius erudierunt; ac deinde Scrofam Tremellium, qui etiam eloquentem reddidit, et M. Terentium, qui expolivit; mox Vergilium, qui carmine quoque potentem fecit. nec postremo quasi paedagogi eius meminisse dedignemur, Iulii Hygini, veruntamen ut Carthaginiensem Magonem rusticationis parentem maxime veneremur. nam huius XXVIII memorabilia illa volumina ex SCto in latinum sermonem conversa sunt. non minorem tamen laudem meruerunt nostrorum temporum viri, Cornelius Celsus et Iulius Atticus .. cuius velut discipulus duo volumina similium praeceptorum de vineis Iulius Graecinus composita facetius et eruditius posteritati tradenda curavit. Varro R. R. I 1, 10: hos (graecos scriptores de agricultura) nobilitate Mago Karthaginiensis praeteriit punica lingua, quod res dispersas comprehendit libris XXVIII, quos Cassius Dionysius Vticensis vertit libris XX ac graeca lingua Sextilio praetori misit. .. Hosce ipsos utiliter ad VI libros redegit Diophanes in Bithynia et misit Deiotaro regi. See ib. 17, 3. 38, 1. II 1, 27. III 2, 13. Cic. de or. I 58, 249. Plin. N. H.

XVIII 5: Poenus Mago, cui .. tantum honorem Senatus noster habuit Carthagine capta ut, cum regulis Africae bibliothecas donaret, unius eius XXVIII volumina censeret in latinam linguam transferenda, cum iam M. Cato praecepta condidisset, peritisque linguae punicae dandum negotium, in quo praecessit omnes vir clarissimae familiae D. Silanus. Comp. ib. XVII 11. 16. 19. 30. XVIII 7. 23. XXI 68. Also XIX 57: Sabinus Tiro in libro Cepuricon (*Κηπουρικῶν*) quem Maecenati dicavit. Ib. XVIII 42 Sora Mamilius, and in the list of his authorities in books VIII, X, XVII, XVIII, XIX, perhaps also XI. On Saserna see Varro R. R. I 16, 5. Colum. I 1, 6 (Saserna .. eo libro quem de agricultura scriptum reliquit). Varro R. R. II 1, 11: Scrofa noster, cui haec aetas defert rerum rusticarum omnium palmam.

2. Scriptores rei rusticae veteres latini, curante I. M. Gesnero, Lips. 1735. 2 voll. 4. Ed. secunda (by I. A. Ernesti), Lips. 1773 sq. 4. In the Bipont series (1787) 3 voll., to which was added a fourth, Lexicon rusticum, 1788. The same illustravit I. G. Schneider, Lips. 1793—96. 4 tomi in 9 parts.

45. Medical art was unknown at Rome during more than five centuries. The simple and invigorating way of living caused it to be but rarely wanted; in cases of need, there were domestic remedies and incantations good for man and beast. This was still the opinion of Cato the Elder who inveighed against the Greek physicians, who resorted to Rome in constantly increasing numbers, and in whose hands the practice of scientific medicine remained almost exclusively, until the Arabs began to rival them. Only a small number of Latin works exist on medical subjects. Under Tiberius, Celsus wrote his Encyclopaedia, of which we possess the books relating to medicine. They are compiled after Greek originals, with sound judgment and in polished language. The works of Pliny the Elder also contain much concerning the history of medicine. The African writer Caelius Aurelianus in the second century A. D. is of greater importance, as a methodical writer who described the various forms of maladies in barbarous language, but with much clearness. The Empiricists Scribonius Largus in the first century after Christ, and Serenus Samonicus (in the beginning of the 3rd) wrote on the various remedies, the one treating in a dry manner of compound remedies, the other furnishing a popular compendium in metrical form. So did Vindicianus in the 4th century. Besides these, the fourth and fifth centuries after Christ supply a number of stupid Empiricists, who propounded much superstition in

unpolished language, e. g. Theodorus Priscianus, Sex. Placitus, Marcellus (Empiricus) and the forgers writing under the names of Apuleius (Barbarus), Antonius Musa and Plinius (Valerianus). In the fourth and fifth centuries we have also veterinary works by Pelagonius and P. Vegetius.

1. Plin. N. H. XXIX 5: milia gentium sine medicis degunt, nec tamen sine medicina, sicut populus rom. ultra sexcentesimum annum, nec ipse in accipiendis artibus lentus, medicinae vero etiam avidus. 6: Cassius Hemina . . . auctor est primum e medicis venisse Romam Peloponneso Archagatum (a. V. C. 535). ib. 7 Cato's warning to beware of Greek physicians: iurarunt inter se barbaros necare omnes medicina (cf. Plut. Cato mai. 23). ib. 8: profitetur (Cato) esse commentarium sibi quo medeatur filio, servis, familiaribus . . . Solam hanc artium graecarum nondum exercet romana gravitas in tanto fructu; paucissimi Quiritium attigere, et ipsi statim ad Graecos transfugae; immo vero auctoritas aliter quam graece eam tractantibus, etiam apud imperitos expertesque linguae, non est. The oculists also whose names we learn from their seals, are, to conclude from their cognomina, most of them of Greek origin, and on account of the frequency of the names Iulius and Claudius, belong to the first century and the first half of the 2nd century after Christ; C. L. Grotefend, the marks of the Greek oculists collected and explained, Hannover 1867. But the greater the number of quacks and cheats among the Greek physicians (one of the cleverest was Asclepiades of Prusa at the close of the republic), the less respected was the whole profession; comp. e. g. in Vopisc. Firm. 7, 4 the expression: sunt Aegyptii . . mathematici, haruspices, medici.

2. Kurt Sprengel, a pragmatical history of medical art, I (Halle 1792), 4th edition by J. Rosenbaum, Leipzig 1846, I p. 199—225. Hecker, History of medicine II. E. Isensee, History of medicine I (Berlin 1840) p. 103—180. L. Choulant, Bibliographical handbook for the history of ancient medicine, 2nd ed., Leipzig 1841, espec. p. 161 sqq.

46. Military science and history were introduced into literature only in the Imperial period, and thus we have Hyginus' work on Encamping (see below 48), Sex. Julius Frontinus' Strategematica (under Domitian), the last or 4th book of which dates, however, from the 4th or 5th century, and Vegetius' work (in the 4th century) Epitome institutionum rei militaris.

1. In the Republican time we may perhaps mention the defence of his strategical conduct addressed by Scipio Africanus the Elder in a Greek letter to king Philip: see Polybius X 9, 3: *διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῆς πρὸς Φίλιππον αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ποπλίου σαφῶς ἐκτεθειμένος ὅτι τούτοις τοῖς ἐκλογισμοῖς χρησάμενος . . καθόλου τε τοῖς ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ πράγμασιν ἐπιβάλοιτο καὶ κατὰ μέρος τῇ τῆς Καρχηδόνος πολιορκίᾳ.*

47. Concerning architecture, we have only M. Vitruvius Pollio's work de architectura (in ten books), of the Augustan period.

48. On account of the military colonies and the measuring of the Empire under Augustus, the importance of the art of measuring the land was so increased that schools were instituted exclusively for this in the Imperial period, and a peculiar kind of literature, half mathematical and half juridical, was formed, extending from the first century after Christ to the sixth. The oldest of these literary land measurers (gromatici, agrimensores) is Frontinus (see 46), whose work was in the Christian time commented on by Aggenus Vrbicus. Under Trajan, Balbus wrote his expositio; to the same time belongs Hyginus the Elder, a little later is Siculus Flaccus. But M. Junius Nipsus, Innocentius, and others whose Latin is partly barbarous, belong to a later date. Many works of Boetius concerning these subjects are of doubtful authority. Other works again are anonymous.

1. Collections: by A. Turnebus (de agrorum condicionibus libri, Paris 1554. 4°.), N. Rigaltius (Auctores finium regundorum, Paris 1614. 4°.), G. Goesius (Rei agrariae auctores legesque, Amsterd. 1674. 4°.), but espec.: Gromatici veteres ex recensione C. Lachmanni, Berlin 1848 = the Works of the Roman land-measurers edited and explained by Blume, Lachmann and Rudorff, vol. I; the 2nd vol. (1852) contains the commentaries of the Editors and of Th. Mommsen, espec. p. 320 sqq. 'Gromatic Institutions' by Rudorff.

2. Paul. Diac. p. 96 M.: groma appellatur genus machinolae cuiusdam quo regiones agri cuiusdam cognosci possunt, quod genus Graeci γνώμονα dicunt. See, in general, Zeiss, Ztschr. für AltW. 1840 nr. 106—108 and the article on Agrimensores by W. Rein and E. Wölfflin in Pauly's Encyclopaedia I 1 p. 594—596. On the popular element in the language of the Gromatici see A. F. Pott, Ztschfr. f. AltW. 1854 p. 219 sqq.

49. The writers on weights and measures belong likewise to the Imperial period.

1. Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae. Collegit, recensuit, partim nunc primum edidit Fr. Hultsch. Vol. II quo scriptores romani et indices continentur. Lipsiae 1866. Contains a preface on the critical sources and explanation of the marks, p. I—XXXI; prolegomena in scriptores romanos (historical and literary) p. 1—45. Extracts from Varro L. L. p. 49—53; from Columella p. 53—56; from Frontin. de limit. p. 56—59; from Hygin. de cond., p. 59—61. Volusius Maecianus p. 61—75. Extracts from Festus p. 75—82; Priscian p. 82—86;

Victorius p. 87 sq. The carmen de ponderibus p. 88 — 98; that de librae . . partibus p. 99 sq. Epiphanius p. 100—106. Extracts from Isidor, p. 106—123 and p. 135—142. Varia fragmenta p. 123—135. Calvi versio tabularum Alexandrinarum p. 142—146.

50. Geography was among the Romans first separately treated by Varro the polyhistor (de ora maritima; de aestuariis), but generally only as an addition or appendix to history, the subject and its treatment remaining dependent on the Greeks except so far as individual knowledge added to their materials, as in Cato's Origines, in Caesar and in Sallust. Some also described their travels and what they themselves had seen, e. g. Statius Sebosus. But only the measuring and description of the whole Roman Empire, accompanied by maps and geographical treatises — a work designed by Caesar, but carried out by Augustus under the direction of Agrippa — furnished a comprehensive and trustworthy basis. The careful, and in its way critical, labour of Pomponius Mela followed soon afterwards, then Pliny's Survey of geography in books III to VI of his Natural History. Seneca's Quaest. nat. contain a kind of mathematical and physical geography, and Tacitus' Germania and Agricola furnish materials for a knowledge of Germany and Britain. But no complete geography was afterwards undertaken by any Roman. Pliny's work was epitomized about Hadrian's time and enlarged with notices from other sources, and from this Solinus, in the 3rd century, made his abridgment. Again in the 3rd century Iulius Titianus the Elder wrote his descriptio provinciarum imperii romani. In the 4th century we have the geographical poems of Avienus (orbis terrae and ora maritima) and Ausonius' Mosella; the history of Ammianus Marcellus contains also much geographical material. At the beginning of the 5th century Rutilius Namatianus wrote his Itinerarium (de reditu suo) in elegiac metre; about the same time (or still at the end of the 4th century) Vibius Sequester wrote his schoolbook on the geographical names occurring in the standard poets. Of the two 'cosmographies' current under the name of Aethicus (i. e. ἠθικός) Ister, the one containing Extracts from the cosmography of Julius (Honorius) Orator is a mere catalogue, the other is a connected description; a third is a medieval production. To the ninth century belongs the so-called Geographus Ravennas. Lists of the roads, stations and distances are found

in the 'Itineraria', of which we have three in the 4th century, the It. Antonini, the I. Hierosolymitanum (from Burdigala to Jerusalem) and the It. Alexandri. The original of Peutinger's map (the Tabula Peutingeriana) may probably have belonged to the middle of the 3rd Christian century. Frontinus' work de aquis urbis Romae (at the end of the first century) is limited to the narrow circle of the metropolis, as well as the Index of the 'regiones' of Rome in the 4th century, which exists in two texts (prob. 334 and 360 A. D.), and to the medieval interpolations of which the two pretended writers, P. Victor and Sex. Rufus, owe their existence.

1. Ukert, The Geography of the Greeks and Romans, espec. I 1. Gotha 1816. Lelewel, History of Geography, in his minor writings on geogr. and hist. subjects (translated by Neu, Leipzig 1836). A. Forbiger, Manual of ancient geography, Leipzig 1842, and other works of this kind.

2. The tabula Peutingeriana, so-called after the Augsburg senator Konrad Peutinger who obtained it from its finder Konr. Celtes (Worms 1507), is the copy of an old original, painted on 12 broad strips of parchment a. 1265 at Colmar, at present in the Imperial library at Vienna into which it came from the collection of Prince Eugene. It is a travelling map, comprising the whole world so far as then known to the Romans; there is a piece wanting in the West; the dimensions are strongly pressed together from North to South, but all the more drawn out from East to West. The proportion of breadth to height is $21^1/_4 : 1$. It was published by C. F. von Scheyb, Vienna 1753 fol., by Mannert, Lips. 1824 fol., in Katancsichs Orbis antiquus e tab. Peut. (Buda 1824 f. 4.), and in Recueil d'Itinéraires anciens by Fortia d'Urban, Paris 1845. 4. Comp. also: On the roads in the T. P. from Vindonissa to Sumlocensis and from there to Regino, by A. Pauly, Stuttgart 1836. 4°. with map. On the T. P. and the border-tribes placed in it between the Rhine and the mouths of the Danube see E. v. Wietersheim, History of the Migration of tribes, Vol. II, Excursus c. On that part which concerns Gaul, see A. Maury in the Revue arch. 1864 I p. 60—63. E. Paulus, An explanation of the T. P. with special reference to the Roman roads from Windisch (Vindonissa) to Ratisbon (Reginum) and from Pfin (ad fines) to Augsburg (Aug. Vind.), Stuttgart 1867. with a lithograph.

3. In respect to the later Roman Empire the Byzantine diplomatic and political Directory is of much importance: Notitia dignitatum et administrationum omnium, tam civilium quam militarium, in partibus orientis et occidentis, an official work, compiled at the end of the 4th century. The principal edition is by E. Böcking (Bonn 1839—1850, with an Index 1853); the text (with illustrations) amounts to 116 pp., the remainder belongs to the commentary.

B. SPECIAL AND PERSONAL PART.

I.

THE HISTORY OF ROMAN LITERATURE
to the year V. C. 514.

51. All written compositions in the oldest time exceeding the limits of mere registers, had no doubt a certain rhythmical form and were therefore 'carmina'.

1. Concerning the age of writing at Rome: in Latium litteras attulerunt Pelasgi, Plin. N. H. VII 57, 193. Perhaps, however, an alphabet was not obtained from Cumae till after the reign of the Tarquins, Schwegler I p. 36. Mommsen, H. of Rome, I² p. 199 sq., is justly in favour of the great antiquity of writing at Rome.

2. Carmen e. g. Liv. I 24, 26 (lex horrendi carminis), 32. III 64 (rogationis carmen). X 38 (formula of oath). 41. Cic. de legg. II 23, 59 (the XII tables). de or. I 57 extr. Ritschl, Sat. poes. I p. 4 sq. H. Düntzer, on the word carmen in the meaning of a sentence or formula, in Mützell's Journal for Gymnasia, 1857 p. 1—33, and against him O. Ribbeck in Jahn's Jahrb. LXXVII p. 201—213.

3. C. Zell, Vacation-Writings II p. 99 sqq. W. Corssen, Origines poesis Romanae, Berlin 1846. W. Th. Streuber, on the oldest poetry of the Romans, Transactions of the philological congress at Basle, 1847. R. Westphal, on the oldest form of Roman poetry, Tübingen 1852.

52. The old Roman kind of rhythm is denoted by the name of Saturnian, i. e. Italian, verse. A division into two halves of different rhythmical movement is its prominent feature, the first half as a rule ascending, and the second as a rule falling. The four arses seem to be of principal importance, while the theses may be omitted and the laws of hiatus are not observed. The arses as well as the theses may be disyllabic. The loose structure of these lines is strengthened by the link of alliteration. Another theory applies the direct

measure of Greek metres and assumes the following specimen of a Saturnian:

⏑ –́ ⏑ – ⏑ –́ ⏓ | –́ ⏑ – ⏑ –́ ⏓

Dabúnt malum Metélli Naévio poétae.

The Saturnian metre survived for a long time among the people even after the introduction of Greek metres by the comic poets and Ennius, and after its consequent disappearance from literature; at Rome it seems to have gone out of use even sooner than elsewhere.

1. Mar. Vict. III 1 p. 2586 P.: versus cui prisca apud Latinos aetas tanquam Italo et indigenae Saturnio sive Faunio nomen dedit. Another derivation, from satura, is given by Mommsen R. H. I² p. 206 note.

2. Serv. Verg. Ge. II 385: ad rhythmum solum compositus. Comp. W. Teuffel in Jahn's Jahrb. LXXVII p. 281. Niebuhr's view, K. F. Hermann's (Culturgesch. II p. 57); R. Westphal (dissertation 1852, somewhat modified Allgem. Metrik, 1865, p. 251—256) and others. — If so, the later popular songs would be a mere revival of the original prosody, long suppressed by art-poetry. Altogether the Saturnian, when so viewed, forms a homogeneous link in the history of popular poetry. See Westphal, l. l. p. 254—256. K. Bartsch, the Saturnian line and the old German epic line. A Contribution to the comparative science of metres. Leipzig, Teubner, 1867, 62 pp. 8°.

3. The Grecizing view: Atil. Fortunat. p. 2680 P.: habet prima parte iambicum dimetron catalecticon, in secunda trochaicon brachycatalecton, quod ithyphallicum dicimus (Pfau: 2 trochaic tripodiae, the first with an anacrusis); but with the admission of so many deviations ut vix invenerim apud Naevium quos pro exemplo ponerem. On this side esp. G. Hermann (Metr. § 525), K. O. Müller (all theses may be omitted, the last excepted; comp. Corssen p. 193 sqq. and W. Hertzberg, Hall. A. Lit. Ztg. 1847. April, p. 765 sq.), F. Ritschl (negative principles: ut nec omittatur unquam vel prioris hemistichii anacrusis vel alterutrius thesis finalis, nec unquam alteri hemistichio anacrusis addatur, nec saepius quam in singulis hemistichiis semel reliquae theses supprimantur, nec quicquam offensionis vel arsium solutio vel neglectio caesurae vel vocalium hiatus habeat; de tit. Mumm. p. II), comp. O. Ribbeck in Jahn's Jahrb. LXXVII p. 199 sqq., and on the other side Corssen, On pron. II p. 418 sqq. Limitations and corrections of Ritschl's theories are given by F. Bücheler, in Jahn's Jahrb. LXXXVII p. 330—342 and espec. A. Spengel, Philologus XXIII p. 81—113, the latter assuming the following five 'laws': 1) the Saturnian line is asynartetic; 2) in no line is it possible to omit more than one thesis, and only the last but one, generally of the second half; 3) the caesura must never be neglected, and falls either after the 4th thesis or the 3rd arsis; 4) hiatus is often permitted; 5) the arses may be solved, and the theses replaced by pyrrhichs and even more frequently by long syllables. A pyrrhich is

inadmissible in the last thesis, and only conditionally admissible in the 4th thesis. See also R. Westphal, allgem. Metrik, esp. p. 252 sq. Mommsen, R. H. I p. 206 sq., takes a mediating view.

4. Flavii Sosipatri Charisii de versu Saturnio commentariolus, ex cod. Neap. nunc primum ed. a F. G. Schneidewin. Gott. 1841. 4. See H. Keil, Philologus III p. 90 sqq.; the evidence of the authors is collected by J. A. Pfau, de numero saturnio Spec. I (Quedlinburg 1846. 4.) and de numero saturnio commentatio (Quedlinb. 1864. 8°.) p. 7—49.

5. H. Düntzer and L. Lersch, de versu quem vocant Saturnio, Bonn 1838. 8. (the most important point is said to be the number of syllables!). C. H. Weise, On the Saturnian verse in Plautus (sic!), Quedlinb. 1839.

6. Ritschl has conclusively proved that we must form our theories on the evidence of the Saturnian lines of the Inscriptions. The Saturnians of Andronicus and Naevius are only of secondary importance. But it is not very probable that the only metrical form employed by a nation not yet civilised was burdened with a large number of artificial and difficult rules, which were not directly caught by the unaided ear.

7. On its use in popular ditties and Inscriptions see Bücheler in Jahn's Jahrb. LXXVII p. 61. comp. W. Teuffel, ibid. p. 281 sq. W. Fröhner, Philologus XIII p. 208.

8. Festus s. v. navali corona. Atil. Fortunat. p. 2680. Livy XL 52 (V. C. 575). XLI 28 (a. 580). Titulus Mummianus (c. a. V. C. 615), see Ritschl's treatise on it, Berl. 1852. 4. Schol. Bob. ad Cic. p. Arch. p. 359 Or., a. 620. See below 104, 1. 126, 1.

9. W. Th. Streuber, de inscriptionibus quae ad numerum Saturnium referuntur, Zurich 1845. The inscription of Sora (Mommsen I. R. N. 4495), see W. Henzen, Rhein. Mus. N. Series V p. 70 sqq. Diar. inst. Arch. 1845 p. 71 sqq. Ritschl, Monumenta epigraphica tria, p. 14 sqq. Saturniae poeseos reliquiae, Bonn 1854. 4.; Rhein. Mus. VIII p. 288.

53. According to their subject the monuments and compositions of the oldest time are chiefly practical; they partly relate to ritual, partly to political and historical matters, some being of a private, others of a public character. After the 4th century V. C. Law also gains some significance in literature.

A) Concerning rites.

54. At the very ancient vernal festival of the Salii in March these priests, during their procession on the Palatium, used to sing old ritual songs (axamenta) in honour of Mars as the god of light, which had become unintelligible as early as the Ciceronian period and were therefore then commented on; the faithful preservation of them justifies the conclusion that they were committed to writing at an early time.

1. They are ascribed to Numa by Varro L. L. VII 3. Cic. de or. III 51, 197. Hor. Ep. II 1, 85. Liv. I 20. Quintil. I 10, 20. Ter. Scaur. p. 2261. Diomed. p. 473 P. Unlike these Salii Palatini, the Collini (or Agonenses) were of later origin, see Scheiffele in Pauly's Encyclopaedia VI 1 p. 690 sq.

2. Their obscurity is attested by Hor. l. l. Quintil. I 6, 40. Hence the commentary of L. Aelius Stilo (Varro L. L. VII 2. Fest. p. 141. 146. 210. 329) and of Sabidius (? Schol. Maii and Aen. X 241). Later antiquarians were fond of them: Capitolin. M. Ant. 4. Symmach. Ep. III 44.

3. The fragments have often been collected and explained, e. g. by Egger, Lat. serm. vet. rell. p. 72 sqq. Bergk, de carm. Sal. Marburg 1847. 4. Corssen, orig. poes. rom. p. 43. 55—85.

4. Quintil. I 10, 20: versus quoque Saliorum habent carmen.

5. On the whole ritual of the Salii see Scheiffele in Pauly's Encyclop. VII p. 688—694. On Mars as the god of the Sun see Bergk, Ztschfr. für AW. 1856 p. 143 sq., comp. Corssen l. l. p. 28—35, and in Aufrecht and Kuhn's Zeitschrift II p. 1—35. Schwegler I p. 288 sqq. (the god of growth).

6. In the time of the decay of the old religion even the praises of princes were inserted in the songs of the Salii, e. g. of Augustus (Dio LI 20. Mon. Anc. II 19), Germanicus (Tac. A. II 83. cf. Henzen 5382), Verus (Jul. Cap. M. Ant. 21).

55. The Arvalian brotherhood who held a festive procession in May, a short time before the harvest, had also their solemn ancient songs, one of which, together with the minutes of a meeting of this order in the time of Heliogabalus, has fortunately been preserved. It was recited with lively dance-like movements (tripudium) and in alternate singing.

1. On the fratres arvales see espec. W. Hertzberg, de ambarvalibus et amburbialibus, in Jahn's Archiv V p. 414 sqq. E. Hoffmann, the Arvalian brotherhood, Breslau 1858. 4. (also in the Transactions of the philological congress at Breslau, p. 67 sqq.). See L. Preller in Jahn's Jahrb. 79 p. 547 sq.

2. The fragments found at Rome in 1777 have been edited by Marini, gli atti e monumenti de' fratelli Arvali, scolpiti già in tavole di marmo ed ora raccolti, diciferati e commentati, Rome 1795. 2 voll. 4. (a Facsimile II p. 668 and in Ritschl's P. L. M. E. XXXVI A.); since then they have often been printed and explained, e. g. by G. Hermann, El. D. Metr. p. 613 sqq. Orelli, Inscr. I p. 388 sq., see ib. II p. 444. R. H. Klausen, de carmine fratrum arvalium, Bonn 1836. Corsen, Origg. p. 86 sqq. Th. Bergk, Ztschfr. für AW. 1856 nr. 17—19. Melchiorri, Appendice agli atti e monumenti de' fratelli Arvali. Rome 1855. 4

W. Henzen, frammenti di tavole arvaliche, Annal. dell' inst. arch. XXX (1858) p. 47—53. De Rossi, vicendi degli atti de' fratelli arvali, ed un nuovo frammento di essi, ib. p. 54—79. Corp. Inscr. lat. I 28 p. 9 sp. Borghesi, Oeuvres IV p. 394 sqq.

3. New discoveries were made in June 1866 at the 4th milestone of the via Portuensis, in vigna Cercarelli; 72 lines, containing the acts of the order from Oct. 58 until March 59 A. D. Comp. Rossi, Bull. d. archeol. christiana 1866 p. 53—62. W. Henzen, in the Hermes II p. 37—55 and Th. Mommsen, ibid. p. 56—64. [See also Academy, Vol. 1 p. 81 sq.]

56. It may be safely assumed that other sacerdotal bodies also had their old hymns and litanies. There existed also ancient sentences and prophecies in Saturnian metre, attributed by popular opinion to Faunus, Carmentis and others, many of which were collected at an early date, though far more were interpolated and forged.

1. Ennius Ann. v. 222 V.: versibus quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant. Fest. p. 325: versus antiquissimi, quibus Faunus fata cecinisse hominibus videtur, Saturnii appellantur. In the same way Carmentis gave ἐμμέτρους χρησμούς (Plut. Q. R. 56), i. e. in Saturnians (Varro L. L. VII 88). Similiter Marcius et Publicius vates cecinisse dicuntur (Cic. de div. I 50, 115). Hor. Ep. II 1, 26: annosa volumina vatum, and on this Porphyrio: veteres libros Marci vatis Sibyllaeque et similium. Comp. Fest. p. 326 b. M.: ex libris Sibyllinis et vaticinio Marci vatis. Corssen, Origg. p. 6—15. 162. Mommsen I² p. 204. 213.

2. Marcius (Cic. l. l. Liv. XXV 12. Macrob. Sat. 1, 17. Plin. N. H. VII 33. Porphyr. l. l., cf. Festus p. 165: Cn. Marc.) lived some time (uncertain how long) before the 2nd Punic war (vates hic Marcius illustris fuerat etc. Liv. l. l.). Several men of this name are mentioned by Cic. de div. I 40, 89 (Marcii fratres, nobili loco nati); II 55, 113 (nec Publicio nescio cui nec Marciis vatibus). Serv. on Aen. VI 70. Symmach. Ep. IV 34. See below 74, 3. The specimens quoted by Livy are adapted to the Saturnian metre by Westphal, on the form of the oldest poetry of the Romans, p. 58.

57. Ritualistic directions, songs and prayers in Umbrian and in Latin are contained in the seven plates found at Eugubio in 1444 (tabulae Iguvinae) of different periods. The Saturnian rhythm, combined with alliteration, plainly appears in many parts of them.

1. The first complete publication 1723 by Bonarota in Dempster's Etruria regalis. — Lanzi, Saggi di lingua Etrusca Vol. III. R. Lepsius, de tabulis Eugubinis (Berlin 1833), in the Rhein. Mus. II (1834) p. 191 sqq. and: Inscriptiones umbricae et oscae, ad ectypa monumentorum

confectae, Lips. 1841 with an atlas. G. F. Grotefend, Rudimenta linguae umbricae, Hannover 1835—39, VIII parts, and in Pauly's Encycl. IV p. 95—103. C. Lassen, Contributions towards the explanation of the Eugubine plates, in the Rhein. Mus. I (1833) p. 360 sqq. and II p. 141 sqq. See Th. Aufrecht and A. Kirchhoff, on the Umbrian monuments, with 10 plates, Berlin 1849—1851. 2 voll. E. Huschke, the Iguvine tables with the smaller Umbrian Inscriptions. Leipzig 1859. 8.

2. For the Saturnian and alliteration, see Grotefend l. l. p. 98. 99. 100. Westphal, ancient Roman poetry p. 57 sq.

B) POLITICAL AND HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS.

58. The following treaties of alliance are mentioned in the regal period: 1) the apocryphal treaty of Romulus with the Veientians of 100 years' duration; 2) Tullus Hostilius' treaty with the Sabines; 3) Servius Tullius' treaty with the Latins; 4) Tarquinius' (Superbus?) peace with Gabii.

1) Dionys. Antt. II 55: *στήλαις ἐνεχάραξε τὰς ὁμολογίας*, according to Greek custom.

2) Dionys. III 33: *στήλας ἀντιγράφους θέντες*, comp. Hor. Ep. II 1, 24 sq.

3) Dionys. IV 26: *ἵνα μηδεὶς χρόνος αὐτοὺς ἀφανίσῃ στήλην κατασκευάσας χαλκῆν ἔγραψεν ἐν ταύτῃ* etc. and it was *γραμμάτων ἔχουσα χαρακτῆρας ἑλληνικῶν, οἷς τὸ παλαιὸν ἡ Ἑλλὰς ἐχρῆτο.*

4) It was written on the hide of the ox then sacrificed, *γράμμασιν ἀρχαϊκοῖς*, and preserved in the temple of Sancus, Dionys. IV 58, comp. Paul. Diac. p. 56 M. Hor. l. l. Mommsen is against connecting it with Tarquinius Superbus, I p. 143. See also Schwegler, I p. 18 sq. note 2. p. 21. 37, note 9. 43, E. 789.

59. In the oldest time of the Republic we find 1) the document comprising the maritime and commercial treaty with Carthage, supposed to date from the first year of the Republic; 2) the treaty with king Porsena; 3) the treaty of alliance with the Latins A. V. C. 261; 4) the Foedus Ardeatinum in the year 410. To these we may add 5) the lex tribunicia prima of the year V. C. 261, and 6) the lex Icilia de Aventino publicando, of the year 298 V. C.

1) Polyb. III 22: *διαθῆκαι . . ἃς καθ' ὅσον ἦν δυνατὸν ἀκριβέστατα διερμηνεύσαντες ἡμεῖς ὑπογεγράφαμεν. τηλικαύτη γὰρ ἡ διαφορὰ γέγονε τῆς διαλέκτου καὶ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τῆς νῦν πρὸς τὴν ἀρχαίαν ὥστε τοὺς συνετωτάτους ἔνια μόλις ἐξ ἐπιστάσεως διευκρινεῖν.* Th. Mommsen, Roman Chronology, p. 320—325, 2nd ed., considers this as an error of Polybius and says that the first treaty was the one of a. V. C. 406; J. Aschbach, Transactions of the Academy at Vienna XXXI p. 421—428,

and A. Schäfer, Rh. Mus. XV p. 396 sq. 488. XVI p. 288—290 agree with him; but his views are attacked by E. Müller, Transactions of the philological congress at Frankfort (1861) p. 79—92, and H. Nissen, in Jahn's Jahrb. 95 p. 321—332. See also P. J. Böckerath, foedera Romanorum et Carthaginiensium critica ratione illustrantur, Münster 1860, pp. 74. 8.

2) Plin. N. H. XXXIV 14, 139: in foedere quod expulsis regibus populo rom. dedit Porsena ... invenimus.

3) Cic. p. Balb. 23, 53: foedus .. quod quidem nuper in columna ahenea meminimus post rostra incisum et perscriptum fuisse. Comp. Liv. II 33. Fest. p. 166.

4) Liv. IV 7.

5) Fest. p. 318, 30.

6) Liv. III 31. Dionys. X 32.

60. The so-called leges regiae, supposed to be decrees and decisions of the Roman kings, and which partly affect an antique diction and are of a religious character, in reality represent traditional laws of a very high age, which were not, however, written down till a later time and then arbitrarily assigned to single kings.

1. H. E. Dirksen, Attempts at the criticism and explanation of the sources of the Roman law, (1823) p. 234—358. W. Rein in Pauly's Encyclopaedia IV p. 994 sq. Schwegler I p. 23—27, comp. 572, note 1. 664, note 3. Mommsen I² p. 441.

61. The collection of these supposed leges regiae was after its author called ius papirianum. As the oldest ius civile coincides with the ius sacrum, the contents of that collection, with regard to some decrees in it, might to a certain degree be described as ius civile, but more strictly it consisted of religious precepts. The collection seems never to have enjoyed a public reputation.

1. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2 § 2: quae omnes (leges regiae) conscriptae extant in libro Sextii Papirii, qui fuit illis temporibus quibus Superbus .. Is liber appellatur ius civile papirianum .. quod (Papirius) leges sine ordine latas in unum composuit. Ib. § 36: fuit in primis peritus (iuris) P. Papirius qui leges regias in unum contulit. The person and time of Papirius are variously fixed, see Schwegler I p. 24 sq. note 5. The contents *περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν* according to Dionys. III 36. Granius Flaccus' liber de iure papiriano is quoted by Paullus Dig. I. 16, 144. See also Rein in Pauly's Encycl. IV p. 660 sq.

62. The commentarii regum, though wrongly professing to be works of the kings themselves, seem to have contained decrees concerning the kingly functions, very ancient as to the facts themselves, and written down and collected in historical time.

1. Cic. p. Rab. p. r. 5, 15: ex annalium monumentis atque ex regum commentariis. We find special mention of commentarii Numae (Liv. I 31) which Ancus Martius in album relata proponere in publico iubet (Liv. I 32, cf. Dionys. III 36). Ὑπομνήματα Νουμᾶ (Plut. Marc. 8) = libri Numae (Piso ap. Plin. N. H. XXVIII 4) = leges Numae (Serv. Aen. VI 860) = lex Pompilii regis in Pontificum libris (Festus p. 189 M.). So also commentarii Servii Tullii (Liv. I 60) = descriptio classium (Festus p. 246. 249 M.), and in its contents also = censoriae tabulae (Cic. orat. 46, 156).

2. Schwegler, I p. 27 sq. comp. 545, n. 2.

3. The books of Numa on religious and philosophical subjects, discovered a. V. C. 573, and which must be due to a forgery or mystification, are of a different character: see E. v. Lasaulx, on the books of king Numa, in the Transactions of the Bavarian Academy, phil. Class, V p. 83 sqq., and against it Schwegler I p. 564—568. Mommsen I p. 844.

63. The priests made the most extensive use of writing, partly in direct reference to their work, viz. the ritual and worship, and also the sacerdotal law (libri pontificii or pontificum etc.), partly without connexion with it (commentarii pontificum) in noting down events of a public and sacred character which might serve as precedents for future emergencies.

1. Vague citations (pontifices dicunt, docent, apud pontifices legimus etc.) in Varro L. L. V 23. Colum. II 21, 5. Macrob. Sat. III 20, 2. — Publica and pontificum monumenta are mentioned together by Val. Prob. de notis 1, see Th. Mommsen, Trans. of the Saxon Society of Sciences 1853, p. 133.

2. Pontificum libri, Cic. de or. I 43, 193. Hor. Ep. II 1, 26. Macrob. Sat. I 12, 21. Fest. p. 189 M. — pontificii libri, Varr. L. L. V 98. Cic. Rep. II 31, 54, cf. N. D. I 30, 84. Fest. p. 356. — pontificales libri, Serv. Verg. Ecl. V 66. Ge. I 21. Ae. XII 603, cf. Lyd. mens. IV 20. — libri sacri, Serv. Ge. I 272. libri sacrorum, Fest. p. 141. indigitamenta (forms of invocation, and thus probably part of the libri pont.), i. e. pontificales libri, Serv. Ge. I 21. — commentarii sacrorum (pontificalium), Fest. p. 165. 286. 360. — commentarii pontificum, Cic. Brut. 14, 55. p. dom. 53, 136. Liv. IV 3. VI 1. Plin. N. H. XVIII 3. Quintil. VIII 2, 12. — ἱεροφαντῶν γραφαί, Dionys. VIII 56. ἱεραὶ δέλτοι, ib. I 73. ἱεραὶ βίβλοι, ib. X 1.

3. Ambrosch, observationes de sacris Rom. libris, Part. I. Bresl. 1840. 4., and on the religious books of the Romans, Bonn 1843. Schwegler I p. 31 — 34.

64. The Pontifices who possessed the art of keeping account of the time, arranged also the fasti, i. e. a list of the days set aside for the administration of the law (dies agendi, dies fasti), this being part of the table of each month (Kalendarium), enumerating also the feasts, games, markets, sacrifices etc. falling on each day, to which were gradually joined first the anniversaries of disasters, and then other short notices of historical events, as well as observations on the rising of certain stars. After these fasti had become public (§ 78), private persons also undertook the compilation of such in the shape of tables or books, and they became the subjects of learned discussions. After the introduction of the Julian era (709 V. C.) these publications became again official, and were made by the Emperor in his quality of pontifex maximus. In this period we possess a number of fragments of calendars engraved or written (painted) at Rome and in Italian towns, and which extend from the eighth century V. C. to the time of Claudius. When the new chronology had become sufficiently familiar, the industry of private persons found there a new field. There are still two complete calendars in existence, an official one of the 4th century written by Furius Dionysius Philocalus A. D. 354, and a Christian revision of the official calendar, composed by Polemius Silvius (A. D. 448 sq.).

1. Dies fasti per quos praetoribus omnia verba sine piaculo licet fari. Contrarii horum vocantur dies nefasti, per quos dies nefas fari praetorem Do, Dico, Addico. Itaque non potest agi. Varro L. L. VI 4. p. 210 Sp. comp. 7. p. 229. Ovid. Fast. I 48. Liv. I 19 extr.: idem (Numa) nefastos dies fastosque fecit. — Suet. Caes. 40: fastos correxit, iam pridem vitio pontificum per intercalandi licentiam turbatos = Introduction of the Julian era; comp. Aug. 31. Capit. M. Antonin. 10: fastis dies iudiciarios addidit. — Petron. Sat. 30: altera (tabula in poste triclinii praefixa habebat inscriptum) lunae cursum stellarumque septem imagines pictas, et qui dies boni quique incommodi essent distinguente bulla notabantur. — Cic. Phil. II 34, 87: adscribi iussit in fastis ad Lupercalia: C. Caesari .. M. Antonium .. regnum detulisse, Caesarem uti noluisse. On Domitian's accession a committee of the senate was appointed qui fastos adulatione temporum foedatos exonerarent, Tac. H. IV 40. Cf. C. I. L. I p. 377b.

2. Fulvius Nobilior in fastis quos in aede Herculis Musarum posuit, Macrob. Sat. I 12, comp. 13 extr. Varro L. L. VI 4 p. 213 Sp. Censorin. d. n. 20. 22. Charis. I p. 112 P. = 138, 16 K.

3. Verrius Flaccus statuam habet Praeneste, in superiore fori parte, circa hemicyclium, in quo fastos a se ordinatos et marmoreo parieti incisos publicarat, Suet. gramm. 17. Part of this is contained in the fasti praenestini; see below n. 8, 9. Comp. Mommsen C. I. L. I p. 363a. Investigations made a. 1863 showed that the hemicyclium in which, according to Foggini, these fasti were found, is not that of Verrius Flaccus. See Henzen in the Bull. arch., April 1864.

4. Works entitled 'fasti' (Fest. p. 87, 19. Ovid Fasti I 657) were written by Junius Gracchanus, Cincius, Cornelius Labeo, Ovid, Nisus, Masurius Sabinus, Julius Modestus (de feriis) etc. Festus p. 67. Macrob. Sat. I 11 extr. Merkel's pref. to his edition of Ovid's Fasti p. LIII. Mommsen C. I. L. I p. 353. — Astronomical fasti of Clodius Tuscus, Merkel l. l. p. LXVI sq. — In Greek literature we have Jo. Lydus de mensibus.

5. The epigraphic fasti were collected by Jucundus; J. Mazochi (1509?), Aldus Manutius before the 3rd vol. of his Ovid, in the 2nd and 3rd editions; Ge. Fabricius (1587). Comp. C. I. L. I p. 293. Graevius Thesaur. VIII. P. F. Foggini, Fastorum anni rom. a Verrio Flacco ordinatorum reliquiae etc. Rome 1779 fol., and hence in Orelli's Inscriptions II p. 379 sqq. A complete critical collection of these 'hemerologia' and 'menologia' by Th. Mommsen in the C. I. L. I p. 293—360, with antiquarian commentaries ib. p. 361—412. Comp. his Roman Chronology p. 208 sqq. (2nd ed.), and Ideler, math. Chronol. II p. 135 sqq.

6. Only the parts written in capitals in the calendars engraved on stone belong to the oldest Roman calendar, originally perhaps a part of the XII tables; all additions in small writing are later. Th. Mommsen, Rhein. Mus. XIV p. 82 sq. 85. C. I. L. I p. 361 sq.

7. The excerpts from the official calendar in those now extant are arbitrary and betray ignorance. Mommsen C. I. L. I p. 363b.

8. Hemerologia now extant, arranged according to their time of composition:

1) Pincianum (July, Aug. and Sept.), written between 723 and 725 V. C., Orelli p. 413. C. I. L. I p. 298.

2) Allifanum (July and August), written before 725. Orelli p. 413. C. I. L. p. 299.

3) Tusculanum, written before 734: C. I. L. p. 300.

4) Venusinum (May and June), probably 726. Or. p. 412 sq. C. I. p. 300 sq.

5) Sabinum (October), written after 735. C. I. p. 302.

6) Maffeianum, a marble slab, written between 746 and 757. Orelli I p. 382 sqq. 411. C. I. p. 304—309. Merkel on Ovid's Fasti p. XII sqq., comp. p. XVII—XXI. LII.

7) Esquilinum (May and June), composed before 757. Or. p. 412. C. I. p. 310.

8) Feriale Cumanum, reaching to 739, written after 757. C. I. p. 310. O. Kellermann in Jahn's Spicil. epigr. p. 3 sqq. 21.

9) The Praenestinum of Verrius Flaccus, written between 752 and 763 (A. D. 10), with additions until 774 (21 A. D.), containing from January to April, and December; in Foggini l. l. Orelli II p. 379 sqq. 408 sqq. C. I. p. 311—319.

10) Vallense (August and September), written after 760 (= A. D. 7) and before 767 (14), with additions to 784 (31). Or. I p. 413. C. I. p. 320 sqq.

11) Ostiense, written before Augustus' death (767), C. I. p. 322. G. B. de Rossi, Bull. arch. 1860 p. 71—80.

12) Vaticanum (March, April and August), written after 768 and before 787, Or. p. 412. C. I. p. 322.

13) Amiterninum (May to December), written after 769 (A. D. 16), and probably before 772 (19), Or. p. 412. C. I. p. 323—325.

14) Pighianum, written between 784 and 790 (31—37), in the last years of Tiberius, C. I. p. 326.

15) Antiatinum (the last six months of the year), reaching to A. D. 19, written a. 804 (51), under Claudius. Orelli p. 413. Henzen 6445. C. I. p. 327—329.

16) Farnesianum (Febr. and March), Or. p. 412. C. I. p. 330.

17) Vrbinas, C. I. p. 330.

18) from the aedes Concordiae at Rome,

19) from the via Gratiosa at Rome, Nr. 16—18 probably as early as the time of the Julian dynasty; C. I. p. 331.

9. The official calendar in the middle of the 4th century of the Christian era was, about the close of the year 354, copied by the calligrapher Furius Dionysius Philocalus, who illustrated it with numerous pictures and dedicated his work to a certain Valentinus. It was preserved in 2 copies, the one of which (Peirescianum, saec. 8 or 9) was again lost and now exists only in two copies of the 17th century (at Brussels and in the Vatican Library); of the 2nd (saec. 9), originally at Strasburg, now at Bern, only December is still extant, but at Vienna there is a complete copy of it made in 1480. It has been repeatedly edited, e. g. by Lambecius, Bibl. Caesarea, Append. comm. l. IV (Vienna 1671) p. 271—302, X. Schier, Kalendarium Furii D. Ph., Vienna 1781. Montfaucon, Antiq. Suppl. I p. 25—37. Graevius Thes. VIII p. 95—113, but espec. Mommsen C. I. I p. 334—356, which should be combined with his treatise on the chronicler of a. 354, in the Transactions of

the Saxon Society of Science, II (1850) p. 550 sqq. 565 sqq., and the resumé in the C. I. I p. 332 sq.

10. The calendar of Polemius Silvius was written a. 448 sq. under Valentiuian III and is addressed to the bishop Eucherius († at Lyons 450). In his Christian zeal the author has omitted all that seemed like pagan superstition, and added historical dates, grammatical and meteorological observations etc. of his own. It is preserved in a Brussels ms.; edited in Henschen's Acta sanctorum, June VII (1717) p. 173—184, and hence iu Migne's Patrologia XIII (1845) p. 675 sqq.; now, in correspondence with that of Philocalus, by Th. Mommsen, C. I. I p. 335—357. See also his treatise on the Laterculus of Polemius Silvius, in the Trans. of the Saxon Society III (1853) p. 231—277, on Cassiodorus, ibid. VIII p. 694—696, and the resumé C. I. I p. 333b.

11. Besides these we have a rustic calendar, containing the rustic business, festivals, the length of months and days etc. (menologium rusticum), in two versions, not differing materially: menol. rust. Colotianum and Valiense, edited the last time C. I. I p. 358 sq., comp. Graevius Thes. VIII p. 19 sqq. Orelli II p. 380 sq.

65. From denoting lists of days and months, the name of fasti was also transferred to lists of years containing the names of the chief annual magistrates (fasti consulares), the triumphs held in each year (fasti triumphales), and the priests (fasti sacerdotales). Fragments of fasti in this sense of the word have likewise come down to us, and of these the fasti capitolini are by far the most important.

1. Fasti as lists espec. of magistrates, e. g. Liv. IX 18: in annalibus magistratuum fastisque. Cic. in Pis. 13, 30: hos consules fasti ulli ferre possunt? ad Brut. I 15: in fastis nomen adscribitur; comp. Tac. A. III 17: e fastis radere. Trebell. Gallien. 15: Gallienum tyrannum in fastos publicos retulerunt.

2. Fasti capitolini, so called from the present place of the fragments in the Capitol; they were discovered in the vicinity of the Roman forum in the 16th and 19th centuries; originally they had been engraved on the marble wall of the temple of Castor or of the regia, first after 718 and before 724 V. C. (the names of Mark Antony and his grand-father having been removed, owing to the senatus consultum of 724, were replaced later), and not continued until a. 742; the magistrates of 742 to 766 as well as the secular games were probably added under Domitian. A further continuation of this official list seems to have been less wanted on account of the impaired dignity of the Consuls and the increased frequency of denoting the year according to the trib. pot. of the Emperors; in the municipial towns this was always a matter of interest; witness the fasti Caleni on A. D. 289, in Orelli-Henzen 6447. On the history of these official

fasti, their discovery and publication, see W. Henzen, C. I. I p. 415—425.

3. The fasti capitolini were a catalogue of the successive consuls, censors, dictators and magg. eqq. (fasti consulares in their principal contents), and, as on the side-pillars of the chief wall, of the triumphs that had been celebrated (f. triumphales). The latter extend from Romulus until V. C. 735, and the first also may originally have extended to the regal period. The chronographer of a. 354 (Anon. Noris.) is the last writer who can be shown to have made direct use of these fasti.

4. The fasti capitolini with supplements edited e. g. by J. G. Baiter, Zürich 1838, and espec. by W. Henzen C. I. I p. 425—442, with notes ib. p. 443—451. A comparative collection of the dates of the authors and the fasti with regard to the years V. C. 245—766 by Th. Mommsen ib. p. 483—552.

5. There are also 16 minor fragments of consular and triumphal fasti of the Republican time and that of Augustus, edited and explained by W. Henzen, C. I. I p. 465—479. Of special importance are the fasti Venusini (formerly Capuani), nr. VI, p. 467—471, edited also in Mommsen's I. R. N. 697; as well as the Barberine fasti triumphales, C. I. nr. XVI, p. 477—479.

6. The entries into the fasti sacerdotales were made annually, as appears from the varying character of the writing; see Orelli-Henzen 6053. 6058. Th. Mommsen, on fasti sacerdotales from Bovillae, Ztschr. für AW 1845, n. 65, p. 513—517. B. Borghesi, frammento di fasti sacerdotali, and sul frammento di fasti sac. ritrovato nella Basilica Giulia, Memorie III p. 154—225. Monumenti etc. 1856, p. 48—52. = Oeuvres III p. 491 sqq.

66. From the lists drawn up by priests and originally not intended for publication, we should separate the annales pontificum which were from the very beginning written for publication; they were conducted by the pontifex maximus (and hence, it is said, styled annales maximi), who annually exhibited in public a white table on which the memorable events of the year with special mention of the prodigies (regularly mentioned since 505) were set down in the briefest possible manner. Anyone was allowed to copy them. This was a very old custom and was observed until the 7th century V. C. But when notes and publications of this sort by writers became more common, the official ones were discontinued. When they were collected and put into the shape of a volume, they formed a collection of 80 books. But as the place where they were kept, the official residence of the pontifex maximus

(the Regia) was repeatedly, and once the whole town destroyed by fire through the Gauls (a. 364), it follows that those parts of the collection which concerned the oldest time must have been restored from recollection and were less trustworthy, indeed the statements as to the very oldest time must have been mere fictions.

1. Paul. Diac. p. 126: maximi annales appellabantur non (? comp. Hübner p. 419) [a] magnitudine, sed quod eos pontifex maximus confecisset; cf. Serv. on Aen. I 377 (n. 2). Macrob. Sat. III 2, 17 and Cic. Legg. I 2, 6: annales pontificum maximorum as well as (from him) Quintil. X 2, 7: pontificum annales. Comp. ὁ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι (i. e. the respective pont. max.) κείμενος πίναξ in Dionys. Hal. I, 74 according to Niebuhr's emendation; see Hübner p. 414. The name maximi is no doubt of later origin, when there were also other annals, by other authors and of less extent (Hübner p. 419).

2. Serv. Aen. I 377: ita annales conficiebantur, tabulam dealbatam quotannis pontifex maximus habuit, in qua praescriptis consulum nominibus et aliorum magistratuum digna memoratu notare consueverat, domi militiaeque, terra marique gesta, per singulos dies (indicating the days and in chronological order). cuius diligentiae annuos commentarios in octoginta libros veteres retulerunt eosque a pontificibus maximos appellarunt. Gell. N. A. IV 5, 6: in annalibus maximis, libro undecimo. This edition in the shape of a book was perhaps also due to P. Mucius (see n. 3). Mommsen II² p. 463. Hübner p. 422.

3. Cic. de or. II 12, 52: ab initio rerum romanarum (i. e. since time immemorial) usque ad P. Mucium pontificem maximum (c. V. C. 631 – 641) res omnes singulorum annorum mandabat litteris pontifex maximus referebatque in album et proponebat tabulam domi, potestas ut esset populo cognoscendi: ii qui etiamnunc annales maximi nominantur. Their official character and the fact of their being designed for popular use produced also intentional distortion of the historical truth; see H. Nissen, Crit. Investig. p. 97 sq.

4. Cato ap. Gell. N. A. II 28, 6: non lubet scribere quod in tabula apud pontificem maximum est, quotiens annona cara, quotiens lunae aut solis lumini caligo aut [aliut] quid obstiterit. Comp. Cic. de rep. I 16, 25: ex hoc die quem apud Ennium et in maximis annalibus consignatum videmus, superiores solis defectiones reputatae sunt.

5. Livy and, most likely, Dionysius do not seem to have made direct use of the ann. max.; see Schwegler I p. 8 n. 4, comp. p. 11 sq. n. 13. Dionysius indeed says IV 30: ἐν ταῖς ἐνιαυσίοις ἀναγραφαῖς κατὰ τὸν τεσσαρακοστὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τῆς Τυλλίου ἀρχῆς τὸν Ἀρροῦντα τετελευτηκότα παρειλήφαμεν: but these expressions may be meant to denote writers of annals; comp. IV 7 (L. Piso Frugi ἐν ταῖς ἐνιαυσίοις πραγματείαις) and 15 (idem ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν ἐνιαυσίων ἀναγραφῶν).

6. Naegele, Studies on political and legal life in ancient Italy, Schaffhausen 1849, p. 269 sqq. F. D. Gerlach, on the sources of the oldest parts of Roman history, Basle 1853. Schwegler I p. 7 sqq. Mommsen I² p. 432 sq. J. G. Hulleman, disp. critica de annalibus maximis, Amsterd. 1855 pp. 86. 8. Lewis, Investigations into the credibility of ancient Roman history, I, chapter IV & V. E. Hübner, Jahrb. LXXIX p. 401. 407. 411—423.

67. Like the order of the Pontifices, the Augurs had likewise their books (libri augurales) and minutes (commentarii augurum). In the same manner there were libri Saliorum and commentarii XV virorum. Besides this, the various colleges of priests kept their albums or fasti, being chronological lists of the priests as well as the minutes (acta) of their official transactions.

1. Libri augurum, e. g. Varro L. L. V 21. 33. 58. VII 51. Cic. Rep. I 40, 63. II 31, 54. N. D. I 33, 72. II 4, 11. p. dom. 15, 39. Gell. N. A. XIII 14, 1. Fest. p. 253. 322. Serv. Ae. IV 45. IX 20.

2. Commentarii augurum, Cic. de div. II 18, 42. Fest. p. 317. Serv. Ae. I 398.

3. libri Saliorum, Varro L. L. VI 14.

4. Comm. XVvirorum, Censorin. 17, 9. 10. 11.

5. Fasti, Orelli C. I. 2207. Plin. N. H. XI 71, 186. On the fasti sacerdotales see § 65, 6. On the acta fratrum arvalium see § 55, 2.

68. The temporal magistrates also had their corresponding notes, partly such as were written by them (commentarii magistratuum), partly records of which they formed the subject (libri magistratuum). The first treated of the transactions of individual magistrates: commentarii consulum, quaestorum etc. The most important of this kind are the tabulae censoriae (inaccurately sometimes called libri censorii), lists of the persons and possessions of the Roman citizens resulting from each census, as well as accounts of the state of the exchequer. The commentarii censorum, on the other hand, seem to have had a private character and purpose.

1. Commentarii consulum, Varro L. L. VI 88. Commentarium vetus anquisitionis M. Sergii M'. f. Quaestoris, ib. VI 90, 91. 92.

2. Tabulae censoriae, Varr. L. L. VI 86. Cic. orat. 46, 156. de leg. agr. I 2, 4. Plin. N. H. XVIII 3. — Libri censorii, Gell. II 10, 1. comp. τιμητικὰ γράμματα, Dionys. IV 22. Introduction of the censorship, 311 V. C.

3. Commentarii εἰσαγωγικοί (comp. Gell. XIV 7, 1) of former censors, which became hereditary in their families, as a kind of manual, Dionys. I 74. comp. Plin. XXXV 2, 7. Fest. p. 356. Hence the Saturnian line oriéns consúl magístrum povpuli dícat, Vel. Long. p. 2234 P., see Reifferscheid, Rhein. Mus. XV p. 627.

4. Comp. Schwegler I p. 28—30.

69. Libri magistratuum was the name given to the lists of the magistrates of each year, and such may have been kept ever since the magistrates were changed annually. Part of them, the oldest extant anterior to the Gallic conflagration, were written on linen and hence called libri lintei. These were kept in the Capitol in the temple of the Goddess of Memory and are repeatedly mentioned by Livy as one of the sources of his authorities.

1. Liv. IV 7: neque in annalibus priscis neque in libris magistratuum. XXXIX 52 (in mag. libris), comp. IX 18 (§ 65, 1).

2. Linen was one of the writing materials of the olden time, see e. g. Liv. X 38: ex libro vetere linteo the Samnites.

3. Magistratuum libri, quos linteos in aede repositos Monetae Macer Licinius citat, Liv. IV 20. comp. ib. 7. 13. 23. Schwegler I p. 17 sq.

c) Monvmenta privata.

70. Private persons also at an early time put down notes for after-use, both in connexion with their domestic accounts and independently of them, sometimes relating to events concerning the whole (town-chronicles), sometimes touching only such as were of special interest to each family and person (house- and family-chronicles). While the first were caused solely by the desire of preserving the recollection of past events, the second soon had an admixture of individual predilection and a tendency to glorify special persons. The latter may have arisen when the aristocracy had gained greater importance by the downfall of the Royal power; the chronicles of the Fabian gens seem to have been the oldest.

1. Privata monumenta, Liv. VI 1.

2. Ipsae familiae sua quasi ornamenta ac monumenta servabant, et ad usum . . et ad memoriam laudum domesticarum et ad illustrandam nobilitatem suam, Cic. Brut. 16, 62.

3. Naegele, Studies p. 303 sqq. Schwegler I p. 12 sqq.; for further information see § 68, n. 3.

71. To this kind belong the lists of ancestors and pedigrees (stemmata), the inscriptions (indices, elogia) under the ancestral busts, and the funeral laudations of departed members of the family (laudationes or orationes funebres), in all of which historical truth was often disregarded in favour of the purposes of a panegyric.

1. Families of secondary rank were eager to prove their relationship with noble families, and these themselves (e. g. the Antonii, Julii etc.) to carry their ancestral line back to the Trojans and to the gods: Plut. Num. 1. Plin. N. H. XXXV 2, 8. Cornel. Nep. Att. 18. Suet. Caes. 6 etc.

2. Elogia is a name also used of the sepulchral inscriptions, e. g. of the Scipios (§ 73 b). As inscriptions for a series of ancestral images elogia were in later times made from public and private sources. Historical elogia of this kind on men of the Republic, and many of the Imperial period, have been collected and explained by Th. Mommsen, C. I. I p. 277—280. Inscriptions on statues or hermas in libraries ib. p. 281. More below 73.

3. Vitiatam memoriam funebribus laudibus reor falsisque imaginum titulis, dum familia ad se quaeque famam rerum gestarum honorumque fallente mendacio trahunt, Liv. VIII 40, comp. IV 16 and Cic. Brut. 16, 62: his laudationibus historia rerum nostrarum est facta mendosior. multa enim scripta sunt in eis quae facta non sunt etc. The custom of these laudationes is ancient, Dionys. V 7. Plut. Poplic. 9 comp. Polyb. VI 53 and Cic. de legg. II 24, 62. de or. II 11. See also Quintil. III 7 2. XI 3, 153. Gell. N. A. XIII 20. — The first funeral speech on a lady (his mother) was pronounced by Lutatius Catulus (Cos. 652), Cic. de or. II 11, 44.

4. Taylor, lectiones Lysiacae c. 3 (ed. Lysiae, London 1739, 4. p. 680 sqq.). Döring, de laudationibus fun. apud veteres, in his Opusc. p. 100 sqq. Cadenbach, de Romanorum laud. fun., Essen 1832. 4. Schwegler I p. 16 sqq. Gerlach, The historians of the Rom. p. 27—29. H. Graff, de Rom. laudationibus, Dorpat 1862. pp. 96. 8. Th. Mommsen, two funeral speeches of the time of Augustus and Hadrian, trans. of the Academy at Berlin 1863, p. 455 sqq. esp. p. 464. E. Hübner, Hermes I (1856) p. 440 sq.

72. There were also, in the very oldest time, songs in praise of the departed — some of them sung at the funeral procession to the accompaniment of a tibia (neniae), others at festival banquets by boys and later on by the guests in alternation, also to a tibia. Both these customs are of great antiquity, and the first, though in a degenerate form, existed also until later times; the second was dying out as early as

several generations before the time of Cato the Elder. Neither the one nor the other offers any help towards the rebuilding of the oldest parts of Roman history.

1. Veterum instituta, . . . meditata ad memoriam virtutis carmina etc. Tac. A. III 5.

2. Nenia est carmen quod in funere laudandi gratia canitur ad tibiam, Fest. p. 161. 163. comp. Cic. legg. II 24, 62. Quintil. VIII 2, 8. Originally they seem to have been sung at the funeral banquets (according to Nonius s. v. silicernium denotes convivium funebre taking place antiquo more ad sepulcrum cum defuncti laude) and by the members of the family (comp. Suet. Aug. 100); later on, they were recited before the mourners' house and at the place of burning by hired plaining-women, praeficae (so Naevius ap. Ribbeck Com. p. 25: haec . . praeficast, quae sic mortuum collaudat; Plaut. Truc. II 6, 14 sq.: praefica, quae alios collaudat etc. Varro L. L. VII 70; mulier . . quae ante domum mortui laudes eius caneret and other passages): hence they became insipid and soon got into bad repute (nenia, ineptum et inconditum carmen etc. Non. p. 145, comp. Plaut. Asin. IV 1, 63. Truc. II 1, 3. Petron. Sat. 47. 58. Capitol. Clod. Alb. 12: neniis quibusdam anilibus occupatus, and other passages in Teuffel's article in Pauly's Encyclopaedia V p. 395 sq.).

3: Cic. Brut. 19, 75: utinam exstarent illa carmina quae multis saeclis ante suam aetatem in epulis esse cantitata (deinceps, Tusc. IV 2, 3) a singulis convivis (a later custom adopted from the Greeks, Mommsen I^2 p. 205. 424) de clarorum virorum laudibus in Originibus scriptum reliquit Cato! Comp. Tusc. l. l. and I 2, 3. Val. Max. II 1, 10. On the other hand, Varro says ap. Non. s. v. assa voce: in conviviis queri modesti (comp. Mommsen I^2 p. 205. 214) ut cantarent carmina antiqua, in quibus laudes erant maiorum, et assa voce et cum tibicine. Comp. also Hor. Od. IV 15, 25 sq.: virtute functos more patrum duces . . canemus, and I 12. This is referred to Numa by Cic. de or. III 51, 197. Quintil. I 10, 20. Songs in praise of Romulus are mentioned by Dionys. I 79. Plut. Num. 5.; of Coriolanus, by Dionys. VIII 62. Comp. Zell, Vacation-writings II p. 170 sqq. 193 sqq.

4. Niebuhr was of opinion that these songs formed a continuous epic poem and hence originated the theory that this epic poem was the source of our extant version of Roman history, which he thought would account for its poetical character. On this view (which may now be considered antiquated) see espec. W. Corssen, Origg. p. 112 sqq. 162 sqq. Schwegler I p. 53—63 and H. Cl. Willenborg, de Diocle . . deque Niebuhrio antiquissimam gentis rom. memoriam e carminibus manasse adfirmante, Münster 1853.

73. We have relics of a similar kind in the inscriptions on votive presents, pillars and tombs, of which we possess a large number belonging to the first centuries of

the Republic partly through literary, and partly through epigraphic records. Of the first kind are 1) the inscription on the linen coat-of-mail of Tolumnius dedicated by A. Cornelius Cassus a. V. C. 317 (325?) and seen even by Augustus. 2) the tabula triumphalis of the dictator T. Quintius of the year 374. 3) the sepulchral inscription of A. Atilius Caiatinus (Cos. 496). — Of the second class: a) the inscription on the columna rostrata erected to C. Duilius in honour of his naval victory over the Carthaginians a. 494. b) the oldest three of the epitaphs of the Scipios, the inscription in memory of L. Cornelius Cn. f. Scipio (Cos. 456), his son L. Cornelius Cn. f. Scipio (Cos. 495) and the elogium in Saturnian lines. c) of other inscriptions the epitaphs of the Fourii (C. I. I 63 sqq.), a few Praenestine inscriptions (ib. 74 sqq.), as well as two fragments of a Senatuscons. of Venusia (ib. 185 sq.) may belong to the fifth century V. C.

1. Liv. IV 20.

2. Liv. VI 29. Fest. p. 363.

3. Cic. Cato 17, 61: carmen incisum in sepulcro; comp. de fin. II 35, 116. Pauly's Encyclop. I 2 p. 2017 sq.

a) Besides older works now antiquated, see F. Ritschl, Inscriptio quae fertur columnae rostratae Duillianae, Berlin 1852. 4.; Comm. altera, Bonn 1851. 4.; P. L. M. E. XCV, and Mommsen, C. I. I 195 (p. 37—40). The present text of the inscription cannot be the original, but dates from the time of the Emperor Claudius; at the very best, it is the original text renewed and to a certain extent modernized (Ritschl, Rh. Mus. IV p. 19); but the many forms of exaggerated archaism, standing side by side with later forms, as well as numerous material difficulties (see also Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. II p. 1279 sq. n.) and its general loquacity, render Mommsen's view more probable, viz. that the column originally had either no inscription at all, or only a very short one, and that the extant one was made when the monument itself was restored under Claudius in accordance with accessible historical sources and with intentional imitation of the archaic style.

b) The epitaphs of the Scipios were discovered in the via Appia a. 1614 and 1780, and have often been printed and explained, e. g. by Visconti, Orelli and others. They are now found in Ritschl's P. L. M. E. XXXVII—XLII and in Mommsen's volume 29—39, p. 11—21. Those belonging to the time anterior to 514 are there no. 29, 31, 32, p. 16. 17 sq. On these epitaphs see Ritschl, Rh. Mus. IX p. 1—19. 159. Th. Mommsen, ib. p. 462—468. Rom. Hist. I³ p. 426. F. Bücheler, Jahn's Jahrb. 87 p. 328—330. 236 sq. The Grecian tendencies of the Scipios show themselves also in the adoption of metrical epitaphs.

c) F. Ritschl, de sepulcro Furiorum Tusculano, Berlin 1853. 4. On their time ib. p. III. On the two first inscriptions from Venusia (I.R.N.715 sq. = C. I. I 185 sq.) see Ritschl, Inscr. Aletr. p. XIV and note.

4. The coins and inscriptions of this period, so far as preserved, have been collected in the C. I. vol. I, where the pars prior (p. 1—40) contains the Inscriptiones vetustissimae, bello Hannibalico quae videntur anteriores.

5. In imitation of an old custom Augustus a. 752 surrounded the temple then dedicated to Mars Vltor in the forum Augusti with statues of eminent Romans, beginning with Aeneas, with the addition of suitable inscriptions (elogia). This was imitated in several municipial towns, e. g. Arretium and Pompeii. The elogia which Mommsen considers referable to these Augustan ones, are printed and explained in the C. I. I p. 281—292.

74. The custom of a victorious army singing at their general's triumph ditties either praising or rallying him (carmina triumphalia), frequently in alternating form, is likewise very ancient.

1. Liv. III 29. IV 20. 53. V 49. VII 10. 17. 38. X 30. XXXIX 7. XLV 38. 43. Dionys. II 34. VII 72. App. Pun. 66. Plut. Aemil. P. 34 (*ὁ στρατὸς . . ᾄδων τὰ μὲν ᾠδάς τινας πατρίους ἀναμεμιγμένας γέλωτι, τὰ δὲ παιᾶνας ἐπινικίους καὶ τῶν διαπεπραγμένων ἐπαίνους*). Marcell. 8. Dio XLIII 20. Vellej. II 67. Suet. Caes. 50 sq. Martial I 4, 3 sq.

2. For the amoebaean form see Liv. IV 53. Plin. N. H. XIX 8, 41.

3. The burden io triumphe, is mentioned by Varro L. L. VI 68. Tibull. II 5, 18. Liv. III 29. comp. Hor. O. IV 2, 49 sq.

4. Zell, Vacation-writings II p. 148 sqq. Guicherit, de carminibus fratrum Marciorum et de carminibus triumphalibus militum Romanorum. Lugd. Bat. 1846.

75. The old weather-rules, incantations and magic lines and similar things bore likewise a popular character and were, as a rule, in Saturnian rhythm.

1. Fest. p. 93: in antiquo carmine: hiberno pulvere, verno luto grandia farra, camille, metes. Comp. Macrob. Sat. V 20, 18: in libro vetustissimorum carminum . . invenitur hoc rusticum vetus canticum: hiberno &c. Serv. on Georg. I 101. Plin. N. H. XVII 2, 14 & XXVIII 2 (5), 29: carmina quaedam extant contra grandines contraque morborum genera &c. Ib. XXVII 12, 106 (in negligent trochaic measure: reseda, mórbos reseda! scísne, scisne, quís hic pullus égerit radíces? néc caput, nec pédes habeat). Cato R. R. 160. Verg. Ae. IV 487 sqq. Hor. Ep. II 1, 138. Tibull. I 2, 53 sq. Mommsen I² p. 204. 432. See also above § 11.

D) LEGAL MONUMENTS AND LITERATURE.

76. The constantly increasing legal insecurity and inferiority in which the Plebeians found themselves when compared with the Patricians after the abolition of the royal power, led after many struggles at the beginning of the fourth century V. C. to the design and introduction of a common law of the country, by which the existing customs, most of them merely traditional and not fixed in writing, were at length systematized, and materially improved by the recently gained experience and the knowledge acquired of foreign states and laws; a process resulting in the legislation of the XII tables. Thus the civil law was regulated both theoretically and practically, laws of a religious and criminal character and some referring to the police being also included. These laws were at an early time commented upon in order to keep them in harmony with practical law and the development of the language.

1. V. C. 300 lex Terentilia and the departure of three ambassadors for Greece. They returned a. 302, a legislative committee was then appointed (Xviri legibus scribundis), which commenced its functions in May 303; at first 10 tables were drawn up, and a. 304 two others were added. Hermodorus of Ephesus is said to have assisted them.

2. The legislation of Solon was fixed on as the model, Cic. de legg. II 23, 59. 23, 64. Dig. X 1, 13. XLVII 22, 4. Plut. Sol. 21. 23.

3. The XII tabulae were fons omnis publici privatique iuris, Liv. III 34, comp. Dionys. X 3. Auson. Id. XI 619. Tac. A. III 27. The two last tables are frequently excluded from the usual praise, Cic. de rep. II 36, 61. 37, 63.

4. Diod. XII 26: *βραχέως καὶ ἀπερίττως συγκειμένη*. Gell. N. A. XX 1, 4: eleganti atque absoluta brevitate verborum scriptae, but also quaedam obscurissima aut durissima etc.

5. They were graven on iron (Liv. III57. Dionys. X 57. Diod. XII 26); the original may indeed have perished in the Gallic conflagration, but was afterwards restored from memory. Until the time of Cicero they were learnt by heart in the schools, Cic. de legg. II 4, 9. 23, 59. In Diodorus' time (XII 26: *διέμεινε θαυμαζομένη μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς καιρῶν*) and that of A. Gellius (XX 1) they were still in existence. As for the time of Cyprian, nothing certain appears from his rhetorical expression (Epist. II 2: incisae sint leges XII tabulis et publice aere praefixo iura praescripta sint, — inter leges ipsas delinquitur, inter iura peccatur).

6. Commentators: Sex. Aelius Catus (Cic. de legg. II 23, 59. Top. 2, 10. Pomp. Dig. I 2, 2. § 38), L. Aelius (Cic. de legg. l. l.), L. Aelius Stilo, Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (Dig. L. 16, 237. Fest. p. 210. 322 comp.

p. 174. 321. 376), Antistius Labeo (Gell. N. A. I 12, 18. VII 15, 1. XX 1, 13), Valerius (Fest. p. 321, comp. 253. 355. R. Schöll, XII tabl. p. 35—38), Gaius (of whose commentary 20 fragments have been preserved in the Digest).

7. Since Gothofredus (see Otto's Thesaur. iur. rom. III p. 1—254) the fragments of the XII tables have been collected and explained espec. by H. E. Dirksen, A Survey of the attempts made hitherto at the criticism and emendation of the text of the fragments of the XII tables, Leipzig 1824. Legis XII tabb. reliquiae, edidit, constituit, prolegomena addidit R. Schöll, Lips. 1866. They are also found in Egger, Lat. serm. vet. rell. (Paris 1844) p. 89 sqq. R. Gneist, Institut. syntagma (Lips. 1858). See more in R. Klotz, Hist. of Rom. lit. I p. 328, n. 416 and p. 342 sq. and de XII tabularum libello eiusque origine, Lips. 1858. 4. R. Schöll's Prolegg. capp. 1—4, p. 1—112.

77. The grant of the XII tables soon lost part of its value to the Plebeians by the cleverness with which the Patricians succeeded in obtaining the exclusive right of explaining and applying them. Especially their knowledge of the precise forms of legal proceedings (legis actiones), as well as of the days on which they were religiously admissible, was withheld from the Plebeians.

1. Interpretatio legum, auctoritas prudentum, disputatio fori (ius civile in a limited sense), Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2 § 5. Et interpretandi scientia et actiones apud collegium pontificum erant, ib. § 6. comp. Val. Max. II 5, 2.

2. The legis actiones are partly older than the XII tables, espec. those per sacramentum and probably also the one per iudicis postulationem (as an umpire); less probably those per condicionem, per manus iniectionem, per pignoris capionem. See the literature in Rein's article in Pauly's Encycl. IV p. 902—904 and additions in Schmidt, de originibus legis actionum, Freiburg 1857. 4.

3. Diebus fastis, quos populus a paucis principum quotidie petebat, Plin. N. H. XXXIII 6, 17, comp. Cic. p. Mur. 11, 25, and see above § 64.

78. This state of things was improved by the scrivener Cn. Flavius publishing (c. 450 V. C.), with the assistance of his patron App. Claudius, a calendar of the religious festivals and the legis actiones: Fasti and ius Flavianum.

1. Appii Caeci (see § 80) scriba, cuius hortatu exceperat eos dies consultando assidue sagaci ingenio, Plin. XXXIII 6, 17. Cic. Mur. 11, 25.

2. A list of the dies fasti and nefasti made by him on a slab of clay was placed in the forum, Liv. IX 46. Comp. Val. Max. II 5, 2.

3. Legis actiones composuit, Cic. ad Att. VI 1, 8. comp. de or. I 41, 186. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2. § 7. Hic liber qui actiones continet, appellatur ius civile Flavianum, Pompon. l. l. Later on, it was supplemented and continued by Sex. Aelius who alias actiones composuit et librum populo dedit, qui appellatur ius Aelianum, Pompon. l. l. Mommsen (Trans. of the Saxon Society of Science, 1853 p. 133 sq.) suspects that there may be extracts from the ius Flavianum in Probus' work de notis.

79. When the sources of the law had thus become accessible to all, legal knowledge ceased to belong exclusively to the Patricians; among the earliest jurists we have, besides several Patricians, as the most eminent the Plebeians P. Sempronius Sophus and Tiberius Coruncanius, the first teacher of law.

1. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2. § 37: fuit maximae scientiae Sempronius, quem populus rom. σοφὸν appellavit (Cos. 450 V. C., one of the first Plebeian Pontifices 454, Censor 455, see Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. VI 1 p. 974 sq. nr. 12); C. Scipio Nasica qui Optimus a senatu appellatus est [this must be an error, as the one who received, a. 550, the surname of Optimus, is in all other passages called Publius and was Cons. 563 V. C. Pauly's Enc. II p. 666 sq. nr. 11], cui etiam publice domus in sacra via data est, quo facilius consuli posset. Deinde Q. Mucius [? Bynkershoek conjectures Maximus]. . § 38: Post hos fuit Ti. Coruncanius qui, ut dixi (§ 35) primus profiteri coepit, cuius tamen scriptum nullum exstat, sed responsa complura et memorabilia eius fuerunt. He was consul a. 474 and the first Plebeian pontifex maximus. See Encycl. II p. 722 sq. and E. Schrader, Cor. the first public teacher of law, Civilist. Magazin V p. 187 sqq.

2. It remains doubtful whether Sophus and Coruncanius owed their sacerdotal dignity to their legal knowledge or rather the latter to the first; see Mommsen I² p. 442.

80. The most prominent figure of this period, in fact a man a century in advance of his own time, was Appius Claudius Caecus (Censor 442 V. C., Cons. 447 and 458): the great patrician who abolished in the state the limitation of the full right of citizenship to landed proprietors, who broke through the old financial administration, from whom the Roman aqueducts and streets, the Roman jurisprudence, eloquence and grammar date their beginning, and with whom begins also the first attempt at prose-composition and at art-poetry.

1. Mommsen, H. of R. I² p. 427. 378. 420 and Roman Researches I (Berlin 1864) p. 301—313 (the demagogic character espec. of his censorship). Comp. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. II p. 406 sq. nr. 11. N.

65180

Saal, de App. Cl. Caeco comm. hist., Cologne 1841. 4. W. Siebert, on App. Claudius Caecus, with special reference to his censorship and those of Fabius and Decius, Cassel 1863, pp. 111. 8.

2. His elogium see in Orelli 539, and C. I. I p. 287, n. XXVIII.

3. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2. § 36: App. Claudius . . maximam scientiam habuit; hic Centemmanus appellatus est. Appiam viam stravit et aquam Claudiam induxit, et de Pyrrho in urbem non recipiendo sententiam tulit (the famous speech of a. 474, preserved long afterwards, Cic. Brut. 16, 61. Cato m. 6, 16. Sen. Ep. 114, 13. Tac. dial. 18. 21. Quintil. II 16, 7); hunc etiam actiones scripsisse traditum est (he rather caused the legis actiones of Flavius; Mommsen considers actiones to be an interpolation), primum de usurpationibus, qui liber non exstat. Idem . . R literam invenit (i. e. distinguished the two sounds R and S in writing, comp. Mommsen I² p. 443), ut pro Valesiis Valerii essent et pro Fusiis Furii. The removal of Z from the alphabet is also ascribed to him (Martian. Cap. p. 64, 4 Eyss.).

4. Sollers iuris atque eloquentiae consultus, Liv. X 22. comp. 19.

5. Isidor. Origg. I 37, 2: primus apud Graecos Pherecydes Syrius soluta oratione scripsit, apud Romanos autem Appius Caecus adversus Pyrrhum solutam orationem exercuit (an awkward expression to denote that he was the first to write and edit a prose-composition, see above § 30); iam exhinc ceteri prosae eloquentiam condiderunt.

6. Cic. Tusc. IV 2, 4: mihi Appii Caeci carmen, quod valde Panaetius laudat epistola quadam quae est ad Q. Tuberonem, Pythagoricum videtur. Comp. Fest. p. 317: in Appii sententiis. Ps. Sall. Ep. ad Caes. I 1, 2: quod in carminibus Appius ait, fabrum esse suae quemque fortunae. Priscian VIII p. 792 P. = 384, 3 sqq. Heitz: Appius Caecus: amicum cum vides, oblivíscere miserias &c. (a Saturnian). The first commencement of Roman poetry in imitation of Greek models, Mommsen I² p. 432.

II.

THE FIRST PERIOD OF THE ROMAN LITERATURE.

From Andronicus until the time of Sulla, a. V. C. 514—670.

81. The centuries during which Rome possessed no literature are those of her real greatness. Her literature arose through the demands of school and stage, when the instruction gained by youths from accompanying their fathers to the market-place and into the Senate appeared no longer sufficient, and when the stage was expected to give continuous theatrical exhibitions besides the customary national farces and dances. The Roman literature was, therefore, from its very beginning under the influence of the Greek; through this it was called into life, remained in its way always dependent on it, and thus could gain ground only at the expense of the genuine old Roman character.[1])

The acquaintance with the Greek language and customs is indeed of high antiquity in Italy and Rome. The influence of the Greeks is proved even by the constitution of Servius and the character of the ludi romani[2]); in religion it was kept up by the Sibylline books. Such names, too, as Cocles (*Κύκλωψ*), Catamitus (Ganymedes) indicate an early connexion. At the beginning of the fourth century V. C. the Roman legislation was improved by using that of Solon, and in the course of that century a separate place for the Greeks (Graecostasis) was made in the Roman forum. After the conquest of Campania, at the beginning of the fifth century V. C., this influence increased considerably: such surnames as Philippus, Philo, Sophus, Agelastus, were no longer strange, the customs of reclining at dinner, of erecting monuments and epitaphs in memory of the departed, etc. etc., were then adopted from the Greeks[3]); and when, at the close of that century, the contact with the Greek parts of the South of Italy became more frequent, the Roman nobles were already able to use the Greek language in their missions — the Roman sailors

[1]) Mommsen H. R. I² p. 860 sq.
[2]) Mommsen H. R. I² p. 87. 209 sqq.
[3]) Mommsen I² p. 424. See above § 73b.

and traders having, no doubt, understood it even before. Through the numbers of Greek slaves and freedmen even the lower classes at Rome became acquainted with Greek. After these preparations, the effects were the more rapid and deep when the first Punic war brought the fighting youth of Rome into close and lasting contact with Greek culture in Sicily. Thence a taste for refined enjoyments was imported, and it was probably no mere accident that, in the year after the close of the first Punic war (490—513), Andronicus made his appearance at Rome in the first drama, since which time performances were kept up continually. Even during the second Punic war (536—553) they went on uninterruptedly, inasmuch as most of Naevius' works and one half of Plautus' literary exertions (though perhaps the less fertile half) fall into the time of this war. In it the peculiar virtues of the Roman nation appeared once more in their most brilliant lustre. But when the fearful tension of all powers which was necessitated by it had relaxed, when the feeling of having escaped an immense danger and the exultation at a final victory increased the relish of all the enjoyments of life,[1]) literature also struck deeper roots at Rome, especially as its respectability had been secured by the grant of corporate rights to the poets as early as 548. It also chanced a. 550 that M. Cato brought Ennius to Rome: the future chief of the old Roman party brought him who was destined soon to be the champion of the partisans of Greek literature. Thenceforth Porcius Licinus' words (in Gellius XVII 21) were daily more truly realized:

Poenico bello secundo Musa pinnato gradu
Intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram.

(Comp. also Hor. Ep. II 1, 162 sq.) A patriotic poet like Naevius was grieved to witness the desertion of national customs and the increasing influence of the foreign element.[2]) The ambition of the aristocracy, increasing equally with their wealth, met the popular eagerness for sights half way; together with other popular amusements the dramatic performances were, therefore, eagerly attended; writing plays for them became a tolerably remunerative occupation, and thus besides and after

[1]) The Oscan Atellanae seem also to have come to Rome about this time, see above § 9.

[2]) This appears from his epitaph: when he died, obliti sunt Romai loquier latina lingua.

Plautus we find Ennius, Pacuvius, Statius Caecilius, and Terence busily pursuing it. The wars with Philip III of Macedonia (a. 554—557) and still more the war with Antiochus (a. 553 sq.) contributed greatly to the downfall of the old Roman manners; though they also enlarged the intellectual horizon and put the conception of a universal Empire within nearer reach, increasing also the necessity of exchanging the original Roman character for Grecian civilization and its cosmopolitan and general human tendencies. The superiority of this, however, was so great that there was nothing else left but to adopt and learn from it. Unfortunately most Romans lacked the ability of discriminating in the foreign element between the valuable or necessary and the inappropriate or harmful; without reflection and choice they threw themselves into the arms of Grecian civilization, thus acquiring not only its brilliant lights, but also its striking shadows. At first it was exclusively the nobles who adopted the new fashion; especially the circle of the Scipios esteemed and propagated Grecian culture and also kept tolerably free from its exaggerations.[1]) Africanus the Elder manifested his desertion of the old Roman mode of thought especially by his familiar saying: numquam se minus esse otiosum quam cum otiosus esset;[2]) and the occupation of his leisure becomes manifest from the charge of his adversaries, esp. Q. Fabius, a. 550, that he spent his time over old books and in gymnastics.[3]) Another very respectable advocate of the Grecian tendency was L. Aemilius Paulus (c. 527—594). They both wrote and spoke Greek fluently, as did also T. Quintius Flamininus (Cons. 556), Ti. Gracchus (Cons. 577. 591), C. Sulpicius Gallus (Cons. 588), Cn. Octavius and in general all the Annalists of the second Punic war (Fabius Pictor, Cincius, Acilius). Q. Fabius Labeo (Cons. 571) and M. Popillius Laenas (Cons. 581) wrote verses. Even Cato showed at least in Latin prose an eager literary activity and he who had asserted that the Romans would forget how to act, under the influence of Greek literature,[4]) was in his old age obliged to learn Greek himself. But

[1]) See Naevius ap. Gell. N. A. VII (VI) 8, 5. Val. Max. VI 7, 1.

[2]) Cic. Off. III 1, 1.

[3]) Liv. XXIX 19 s. f.

[4]) See above § 2, 1 and in Pliny N. H. XXIX 7: quandocunque ista gens suas literas dabit omnia corrumpet.

already were the symptoms of the decay of the old Roman severity becoming more frequent,[1]) so much so that a man of the old stamp, like T. Manlius Torquatus, felt strange and solitary in his native town.[2]) With each generation, nay almost every year, these symptoms become more serious, in the breaking up of family life, the contempt of law and order, and even of the native gods. The opposition of the adherents of the old system grew indeed in the same proportion, Cato the Elder especially waged fierce war against these tendencies in his censorship (a. 570). But it was impossible to stop a process resulting from a thousand unavoidable circumstances, to oppose the great change then accomplishing itself with irresistible power, in the religion, life and customs, in the thoughts and actions of the nation. Besides, the means employed were often absurd and not to the purpose. Thus a. 581 the Epicurean philosophers Alcaeus and Philiscus were banished from Rome, a. 593 the philosophers and rhetores latini were again expelled, a. 599 the Athenian ambassadors (whose chief was Carneades) were sent home as soon as possible. But then again a. 587 the Senate decoyed one thousand noble and highly educated Achaeans (Polybius among them) into Italy, and there detained them as hostages during 17 years. Altogether the policy of shameless selfishness pursued by the Roman Senate during this period, and which reached its climax in their abominable conduct towards the unhappy, prostrate city of Carthage[3]) — the frivolous wars tending to nothing but aggrandisement and enrichment waged by Rome continuously after the second Punic war — destroyed the old Roman character far more than Grecian art and philosophy would ever have been able to do. Henceforth there was a fearful increase in internal corruption, immorality,[4]) bribery, an insatiable eagerness for riches, disregarding every thing else and impudently setting

[1]) Liv. XXVI 2, 15 (a. 543): eum (Cn. Fulvius) in ganea lustrisque, ubi iuventutem egerit, senectutem acturum.

[2]) Liv. XXVI 22, 9 (a. 543): neque ego vestros mores consul ferre potero neque vos imperium meum.

[3]) On this Macchiavellian policy see C. Peter, Studies on Roman history, Halle 1863, p. 115 sqq. Even such an ardent admirer of the Romans as Polybius is thereby repeatedly roused to out-bursts of indignation; see XXXI 18, comp. 8. 12. 19 extr. XXXII 2.

[4]) Comp. Polyb. XXXI 24 and espec. XXXII 11 (p. 1096 Bekk.).

aside laws, orders of the Senate and legal proceedings, making war on their own hands, celebrating triumphs without permission, plundering the provinces, robbing the allies. Ignominious treaties and conclusions of peace became more and more frequent. Instead of by virtues, as of old, Rome now extended its power by deceit, perfidiousness and diplomatic craft. A certain culture did, indeed, gradually spread itself among the great multitude also; a fact borne out by the mere occurrence[1]) of numerous foreign words in Plautus (and Ennius), and by the ludi scenici gaining the superiority over the circenses.[2]) But the plays of the palliata which were the principal food offered to the people in the dramatic exhibitions, again contributed greatly to the destruction of morals, and sometimes it became manifest that this whole culture was only a slight varnish, which gave way as soon as the rigour of discipline was relaxed.[3])

The work nearly finished in the sixth century, was completed in the seventh; the year 608 brought the destruction of Carthage and Corinth. In Carthage, the stimulus for continued valour and expertness in war had disappeared for ever, and the very man who was obliged to destroy Carthage, a man more far-seeing than the old zealot Cato, deplored its fall; the fall of Corinth and the abolition of Greek independence caused numbers of Greeks to emigrate to Rome, there to make up for the loss of their home. The peculiar Roman character had now come to an end, and for ever: Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit. From the sixth into the seventh century the noble figure of Africanus minor (c. 570—625) attracts our attention, he who was the friend of Panaetius and Polybius; around him congregated all who tried to keep above water in this sea of egotism, greediness and immorality: among his contemporaries, besides Terence, his brother Q. Fabius Maximus (Cons. 609), his brother-in-law Q. Aelius Tubero, Laelius the younger (Cons. 614), D. Junius Brutus (Cons. 616), L. Furius Philus (Cons. 618), Sp. Mummius, Sex. Pompeius, P. Rupilius (Cons. 622); among the younger men,

[1]) Mommsen H. R. I² p. 857, note.

[2]) a. 574 the circenses lasted 2 days, the scenici five (Liv. XL 52); a. 580 the circenses one day, the scenici four (ib. XLII 10).

[3]) Comp. e. g. Polyb. XXX 13 (from Athen. XIV p. 615) in the year 587.

C. Lucilius (born 606), the sons-in-law of Laelius, C. Fannius and Q. Mucius, as well as Tubero the younger, P. Rutilius, A. Verginius and others.[1]) But the stronger the opposition in which these circles found themselves in their thinking and being to the dominant tendency, the more they fell into aristocratic seclusion and so much the less became their influence. The rottenness of the nobility and the internal corruption of the upper classes became manifest in the Numantine war (611 – 621) and roused the Gracchi (621—631) to their efforts; they stand forth prominently in the war with Iugurtha (643—648) and enable the rude force of Marius, himself a man of insignificant intellect, to gain marvellous successes. His ignorance of Greek was exceptional in his time,[2]) and naturally so among the ruling class;[3]) the performances of Greek plays at Rome in the original Greek attest the great extent of this knowledge. Many inscriptions of this period are written in the two languages, and the Romans who formerly in their palliatae denoted themselves as barbari, share now the lead with the Greeks: they leading in politics, and the latter in culture. The Roman writers of the period acknowledge the superiority of the Greek literature, some by resigning all rivalry in formal polish, as Lucilius did, and others again by striving after correctness and elegance in a higher degree, as e. g. L. Attius; many were by blind imitation even led to shallow trifling, e. g. the Erotic epigrammatists. The political situation led to increased extension and refinement of the popular amusements.[4]) After the year 609, complete theatres in the Greek style, with raised rows of seats all around, were erected annually, though still of wood and in such a manner that the building could always be pulled down again after it had served its purpose; and only after 699 was a theatre built of stone by Pompey. The drama held therefore still

[1]) Comp. Cic. Lael. 27, 101.

[2]) Sall. Iug. 85, 32.

[3]) P. Crassus, Cons. 623, knew five Greek dialects: see below 129, 5.

[4]) Tac. A. XIV 21: possessa Achaia Asiaque ludos curatius editos ... a L. Mummii triumpho (609) qui primus id genus spectaculi (theatrales artes) in urbe praebuerit. See Ritschl, Parerga p. 227 sq. Th. Mommsen, Rhein. Mus. X p. 127. The attempt at reform made by the censors of a. V. C. 639 was an exception and remained without further consequences; see above § 9, 4.

the principal place in literary production. Tragedy was, in the seventh century, respectably represented by L. Attius; in the comedy palliata, togata, the artistic Atellana and Mimus succeed each other rapidly, but in this succession attest a continuous descent in accordance with the taste of the mob, to plebeian farces and the vulgar spectacular amusement. The epic species was still kept up by the impulse it received in the middle of the sixth century (through Naevius and Ennius), without, however, receiving any further encouragement from their contemporary history. In general, poetical production had nearly died out with the exception of the drama, and Lucilius and the erotic poets alluded to. The nation itself was destitute of poetical power and aspiration, nor did the internal disturbances admit of sufficient mental tranquillity. Historical composition, eloquence and jurisprudence grew rapidly both in extension and depth, and learned investigation was carried on diligently in all branches after the middle of the 7th century, in prose as well as in verse, though with the exception of L. Aelius Stilo, generally not by native Roman citizens.

The Latin language and prosody remained in the 7th century pretty much as Ennius had fixed them in the sixth.[1]) Before Ennius the Latin, in consequence of its deep-rooted tendency to degrade the long vowels, especially when final, to shorten syllables, and to weaken and even drop final consonants, was in danger of falling into something like the Umbrian loss of endings, of weakening all its suffixes, losing its declensions, and thus passing even then into the condition of the Romance languages. The dramatic poets before Ennius had made many concessions to the negligent and wavering pronunciation of every day life; Ennius arrested the imminent breaking up of the language, at least in literature, for several centuries. S final was left disregarded even by him, and must have been almost inaudible before consonants in his time; only by the poets towards the close of the Republic was it recognised as a full sound.[2]) But in all other things Ennius has the merit of having resolutely put an end to this state of indecision by attributing a normal value to each sound found in the grammatical language, and thus making

[1]) Comp. Ritschl Rh. Mus. XIV p. 394 sqq.
[2]) Comp. Cic. Or. 161.

every syllable either long or short, and in doubtful cases sanctioning that quantity which his nice ear discerned as the more correct pronunciation.[1]) For his new prosody Ennius introduced also into Roman literature a new measure, the dactylic hexameter, by which he did away with the solution of the arses admissible in the metres used before him, the Saturnian as well as the dramatic.[2]) It is true, his influence extended only to the written language and the conversational language of the educated classes, which was formed on it; while the simple practice of every day life for some time longer pursued its own peculiar development. Not only did the Saturnian metre continue for some time even after the introduction of the hexameter, both in public monuments and in the plebeian kinds of dramatic amusements — but there was in the 7th century even a kind of plebeian prosody, in which the hexameter was indeed employed, but with all the prosodiacal licences of the dramatic poets of the 6th century, adhering also to the practice of solving the arsis; specimens of this we possess in the inscription of Mummius and the sortes Praenestinae. The art-poets too showed the influence of the national style at least in their continued predilection for alliteration.

The language itself was fixed about this time: so was its rendering in writing. The Latin alphabet[3]) is descended from a later form of the Greek alphabet of the Dorians in Kyme (Cumae) and in Sicily, and was therefore at first written from the left to the right. It consisted of 21 letters, among which were X and Z, but no G. In the sixth century the freedman of Sp. Carvilius (Cons. 520 and 526) introduced the letter G, and omitted the Z, a letter not much used from the beginning, and only about the time of Cicero Z and Y were again adopted, and placed at the end of the alphabet. The alphabet of Carvilius likewise consisted of 21 letters. Other regulations of writing are connected with the names of poets, since in the fluctuating state of the Latin language and the scarcity of a fluent practice in writing, the poets had also to be grammarians, in order to express the spoken language accurately

[1]) Ritschl l. l. p. 395.

[2]) Ritschl l. l. p. 407.

[3]) Comp. Mommsen H. R. I[2] p. 198—200. W. Corssen in Pauly's Encyclop. I 1 p. 803—805.

in writing.[1]) Thus Ennius is reported first to have employed the doubling of consonants; L. Attius expressed the long quantity of vowels by doubling them, and Lucilius discriminated the two sounds I and EI — all with this result that their precedence exercised a certain, though not always immediate or constant, influence on the orthography of the most important documents of their time, sometimes even of those in Greek.[2]) Among the vowels, only O and E were written besides A before 520; between 520 and 550 V too came into use side by side with Q, but only between 550 and 568 V and I conquered for ever,[3]) though doubling them was always avoided.

Among the most important documents of the history of the language during these two centuries we have espec. the SC. de Bacanalibus of a. 568, the inscription of Sora, the titulus Mummianus (c. 615), part of the epitaphs of the Scipios, the tabula Bantina (between 621—636), the Epistula ad Tiburtes[4]), the decision of Q. and M. Minucius in the dispute of the Genuates and Veturii concerning their boundaries (a. 637), the lex agraria of a. 643, and others.

A. THE SIXTH CENTURY V. C.

I. Poets.

32. Andronicus (c. 470—c. 550) came as a young man, after the capture of Tarentum (a. 482 = 275 A. D.), to Rome, and being a prisoner of war became the slave of a certain Livius, perhaps the same as the victor of Sena (a. 547), M. Livius Salinator. He gained his living by private instruction in Latin and Greek, was manumitted and received the name (L.?) Livius Andronicus. For his pupils, he translated the Odyssey into Latin Saturnians; but awkwardly and not without flagrant mistakes. Being, besides, an actor, he wrote his own text books; these he likewise translated from the Greek, espec. tragedies, in doing which he imitated the easier Greek measures and kept the popular alliteration. The first performance of a complete play of this kind took place

[1]) Very much in the same way as the earliest compositors (espec. of Greek) were obliged to be scholars.

[2]) H. Sauppe, Göttinger G. A. Nachr. 1867. N. 9, p. 159.

[3]) Ritschl and Mommsen, Rh. Mus. IX p. 14—18. 464 sqq.

[4]) Mommsen C. I. lat. I p. 107 sq.

a. 514 = 240 B. C. a. 547 he was commissioned to compose the hymn for the victory of Sena. For his sake the poets received the grant of corporate rights and a place for their worship in the temple of Minerva on the Aventine hill.

1. Did his praenomen L. (Gell. N. A. XVII 21, 42. Fest. v. surregit, p. 297 M.) arise from the initial of Livius?

2. Hieronym. chron. ad a. 1829, Ol. 148, 1 (= 566 V. C.) probably owing to a confusion of the second capture of Tarentum a. 545 with the first: Titus Livius tragoediarum scriptor clarus habetur, qui ob ingenii meritum a Livio Salinatore, cuius liberos erudiebat, libertate donatus est. Cassiod. Chron. ad a. 515: his cos. ludis romanis primum tragoedia and comoedia a Lucio Livio ad scaenam data. But a. 514 is given by Cic. Brut. 18, 72. Gell. l. l.

3. Sueton. de gramm. 1: antiquissimi doctorum, qui iidem et poetae et semigraeci erant, — Livium et Ennium dico, quos utraque lingua domi forisque docuisse adnotatum est — nihil amplius quam Graecos interpretabantur aut si quid ipsi latine composuissent praelegebant.

4. Liv. VII 2, 8: Livius .., qui ab saturis ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere, idem scilicet, id quod omnes tum erant, suorum carminum actor etc. Cic. leg. II 15, 39: (theatra) quae solebant quondam compleri severitate iucunda Livianis et Naevianis modis. The titles of his tragedies are Achilles, Aegisthus, Aiax (mastigophorus), Andromeda, Danae, Equus Troianus, Hermiona, Ino, Tereus. The fragments collected by E. Klussmann, Rudolstadt 1849. 26 pp. 4. and in Ribbeck's trag. lat. p. 1—5, comp. p. 243—245. Comedies were Gladiolus, Ludius, Virgus (? Ribbeck proposes Verpus, O. Günther Auriga). Fragments in Ribb. Com. lat. p. 3 sq.

5. Cic. Brut. 18, 71: et Odyssia latina est sic tanquam opus aliquod Daedali et Livianae fabulae non satis dignae quae iterum legantur. Gell. N. A. XVIII 9, 5: offendi in bibliotheca Patrensi librum verae vetustatis Livi Andronici qui inscriptus est Ὀδύσσεια, in quo erat versus primus: virúm mihí, Caména, ínsecé vérsútum. The Odyssia seems to be meant in the mention of the carmina Livi as a schoolbook used by Orbilius, Hor. Ep. II 1, 69 sqq. The fragments of the Od. collected by O. Günther, Progr. of Greiffenberg 1864. 10 pp. 4. J. A. Pfau, de numero saturnio (Quedlinburg 1864) p. 70—78: see also Jahn's Jahrb. 87 p. 331—333. 93, p. 566—568 and others.

6. Liv. XXVII 37: decrevere pontifices ut virgines ter novenae per urbem euntes carmen canerent. Id cum in Iovis Statoris aede discerent conditum ab Livio poeta carmen etc. ... carmen in Iunonem reginam canentes, illa tempestate forsitan laudabile rudibus ingeniis, nunc abhorrens et inconditum, si referatur. Fest. p. 333 M.: cum Livius Andronicus bello Punico secundo scripsisset carmen quod a virginibus est cantatum, quia prosperius resp. populi rom. geri coepta est, publice

adtributa est ei in Aventino aedis Minervae, in qua liceret scribis histrionibusque consistere ac dona ponere, in honorem Livi, quia is et scribebat fabulas et agebat. Comp. O. Jahn, Trans. of the Saxon Society 1856, p. 294 sqq. Al. Riese in the Trans. of the philological congress at Heidelberg (Leipzig 1866) p. 161—166.

7. H. Düntzer, L. Livii Andr. fragmenta collecta et inlustrata Berlin 1835. 94 pp. 8.

8. F. Osann, Analecta critica (Berlin 1816) p. 1—28. Stieve, de rei scen. ap. Rom. origine (Berl. 1828) p. 68—90. A. L. Döllen, de vita Livii Andr. Dorpat 1838. 52 pp. 8. W. Teuffel, Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1118—1120. O. Günther in Mützell's Ztschr. 1860, p. 809—814. Th. Mommsen, H. R. I² p. 861—863.

83. Cn. Naevius, a native of Campania, but of Latin extraction, was one of the actors in the first Punic war; he began to exhibit plays in the year 519 = 235, in general in the manner of Andronicus, but with more talent and originality, and with a preference for comedy. The inconsiderate candour with which he assailed in them even leading statesmen (though he did this in a genuine Roman manner) caused him first to be thrown into prison and then to be exiled; he died in exile c. 555. In his later years he attempted a poetical treatment of the first Punic war, the events of which he had himself witnessed, and in this he used the Saturnian measure. Through this national tendency of his, he also created a new kind of drama, the praetexta, and for centuries retained the kindly recollection of his nation. Even in the scanty fragments left to us we seem to feel the traces of a fresh, energetic, talented and self-possessed mind.

1. Gell. N. A. I 24, 1 sq.: trium poetarum illustrium epigrammata, Cn. Naevi, Plauti, M. Pacuvii, quae ipsi fecerunt et incidenda sepulcro suo reliquerunt . . . Epigramma Naevi plenum superbiae campanae (comp. Cic. leg. agr. II 33, 91. Liv. IX 6, 5) . . .: immórtalés mortáles sí forét fas flére, Flerént divaé Caménae Naéviúm poétam. Itáque postquam ést orcíno tráditus thesaúro Oblíti súnt Romaí loquiér linguá latína. 'Supposing that Naevius was not a citizen of Rome but of a Latin town in Campania, we can better account for the Roman police treating him so roughly. It seems certain that he was no actor, as he served in the army.' Th. Mommsen.

2. Gell. XVII 21, 44 sq.: anno post Romam conditam quingentesimo undevicesimo . . . Cn. Naevius poeta fabulas apud populum [primum?] dedit, quem M. Varro in libris [libro] de poetis primo stipendia fecisse ait bello poenico primo, idque ipsum Naevium dicere in eo carmine quod de eodem bello scripsit. See below 84, 2.

3. Gell. III 3, 15: de Naevio accepimus fabulas eum in carcere duas scripsisse, Hariolum et Leontem, cum ob assiduam maledicentiam et probra in primores civitatis, de graecorum poetarum more dicta, in vincula Romae a triumviris coniectus esset. Vnde post a tribunis plebis exemptus est, cum in his quas supra dixi fabulis delicta sua et petulantias dictorum, quibus multos ante laeserat, diluisset. Ps. Ascon. on Cic. Verr. act. pr. 10, 29 p. 140 Or.: dictum facete et contumeliose in Metellos antiquum Naevii est: fató Metélli Rómae fiunt cónsulés, cui tunc Metellus consul (a. 548) iratus versu responderat ..: dabúnt malúm Metélli Naévió poétae. — Plaut. mil. glor. 211 sq. R.: ós columnatúm poetae esse índaudivi bárbaro, Quoí bini custódes semper tótis horis óccubant.

4. Hieron. chron. on a. 1813, Ol. 144, 1 (= 550 = 204): Naevius comicus Vticae moritur, pulsus Roma factione nobilium ac praecipue Metelli (Metellorum?). Cic. Brut. 15, 60: his consulibus (a. 550), ut in veteribus commentariis (in which?) scriptum est, Naevius est mortuus; quamquam Varro noster, diligentissimus investigator antiquitatis, putat in hoc erratum vitamque Naevi producit longius. Varro was no doubt right; Naevius was born c. 485 or 490.

5. Tragedies: Andromacha (? by Ennius?), Danae, Equus troianus, Hector proficiscens, Hesiona, Iphigenia, Lycurgus. Fragments in Ribbeck's trag. p. 5—13, comp. p. 245—247.

6. Praetextae: Clastidium, Romulus s. Alimonium Romuli et Remi. Ribbeck trag. p. 235 sq., comp. p. 348 sq. Grauert in the Philologus II p. 115—130. Röper ibid. VII p. 591 sq. Berchem makes a difference: Lupus s. Alimonium R. et R., Romulus.

7. Comedies: Acontizomenos, Agitatoria, Agrypnuntes, Appella, Ariolus, Astiologa, Carbonaria, Colax, Commotria, Corollaria, Dementes, Demetrius, (Diobolaria?), Dolus, Figulus, Glaucoma, Gymnasticus, Lampadio, Leo, Ludus, Lupus (see n. 6), Nagido, Nautae, Nervolaria, Paelex, Personata, Proiectus, Quadrigemini, Satura (? Festus p. 257 M.), Stalagmonissa, Stigmatias, Tarentilla, Technicus, Testicularia, Tribacelus, Triphallus, Tunicularia. The fragments in Ribb. com. lat. p. 5—25. Comp. Klussmann p. 132—181. Much is uncertain, espec. on account of the frequent confusion between Laevius, Livius and Novius. — The plays with Latin titles may possibly be the later ones. But all belong to the palliata; but Naevius seems to have dealt more freely with the originals than even Plautus, and he already practised contamination (Ter. Andr. prol. 7). Horace's vexed question (Ep. II 1, 53): Naevius in manibus non est et mentibus haeret Paene recens — may be supposed to relate especially to his comedies and perhaps also to his epic poem.

8. Bellum punicum (poenicum). Cic. Cato 14, 49 sq.: si habet aliquod tamquam pabulum studii atque doctrinae, nihil est otiosa senectute iucundius ... Quam gaudebat Bello suo punico Naevius! — Suet. de gramm. 2: C. Octavius Lampadio Naevii Punicum bellum .. uno volumine et continenti scriptura expositum divisit in septem libros. A

certain Cornelius and Virgilius are mentioned as commentators by Varro L. L. VII 39. — Cic. Brut. 19, 75 sq.: Naevi . . Bellum punicum quasi Myronis opus delectat . . . Et luculente quidem (Naevius rem scripsit), etiamsi minus quam tu (Ennius) polite. The first two books contained the mythical history of Rome and Carthage (Aeneas and Dido), and the third opened with the first Punic war. The subject was treated in a prosaic manner, very much like the style of a medieval chronicle. The fragments ex recensione J. Vahlen, Lips. 1854. 20 pp. 4., also in Pfau, de numero sat. (Quedlinb. 1864) p. 79—95. See Jahn's Jahrb. 87 p. 333—336.

9. A. Schütte, de Cn. Naevio poeta, P. I, Würzburg 1841. E. Klussmann, Cn. Naevii poetae rom. vitam descripsit, carminum reliquias collegit, poesis rationem exposuit, Jena 1843, with M. Hertz's observations, Berl. Jahrb. 1843. II p. 217—236. W. Teuffel, Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 396—400. Mommsen, H. of R. I² p. 879—881. 873 sq. 898 sq. M. J. Berchem, de Cn. Naevii poetae vita et scriptis, Münster 1861. 42 pp. 8.

84. T. Maccius Plautus, was born c. 500 = 254 in the Umbrian town of Sassina (which was, however, probably even then latinized), of free, but poor parents. Having at first worked for the stage at Rome, he lost his savings through speculation; he then for some time worked in a treadmill, and afterwards gained his subsistance by Latin versions of Greek comedies, until his death a. 570 = 184. The necessity in which he found himself of working fast in order to make money, as well as the want af originality in his plots, render it easy to perceive that Plautus must have been a prolific writer. But great uncertainty prevailed as to the number of the plays adapted by him especially when the public became accustomed to consider as Plautine any comedy of the palliata class (many of which probably existed only in stage-copies). Varro divided them into 3 classes: 21 considered genuine by all, then those which were probably genuine (19 plays), and last of all spurious plays. Those of the first class (fabulae Varronianae) are no doubt those which we still possess.

1. The name (instead of the old M. Accius) was elicited from the Ambrosian MS. and Gell. III 3, 9 by Ritschl, de nominibus Plauti, Parerga p. 3—43, and was against Geppert (Jahn's Jahrb. Suppl. XIX p. 262 sqq., see also Ritschl's edition of the Mercator p. XI sq.) defended by M. Hertz, T. Maccius Plautus or M. Accius Plautus? Berlin 1854. 32 pp. 8., and by the same against Vallauri: de Plauti poetae nominibus epimetrum, Breslau 1867. 16 pp. 4.

2. Cic. Brut. 15, 60: Plautus P. Claudio L. Porcio cos. (a. 570) mortuus est, Catone censore. Cato 14, 50 he mentions among the

instances of the occupations of senes: quam gaudebat ... Truculento Plautus, quam Pseudulo (performed a. 563)! This agrees also with other dates. Comp. Ritschl, de aetate Plauti, Par. p. 45—70. It must therefore be an error when Hieronym. on Euseb. chron. 1813, Ol. 144, 1 (= 550 V. C.) reports: Plautus ex Vmbria Sarsinas Romae moritur, instead of which M. Hertz proposed moratur, while others assume an error for clarus habetur. — Gell. I 24, 3: Epigramma Plauti, quod dubitassemus an Plauti foret, nisi a M. Varrone positum esset in libro de poetis primo: Postquam est mortem aptus Plautus, comoedia luget, Scaena est deserta, dein risus, ludus iocusque Et numeri innumeri simul omnes conlacrumarunt. — Lessing, an Essay on the life and works of Plautus (a. 1750), Compl. works ed. Lachmann III p. 1—27. C. G. Andresen, de vita Plauti, Altona 1843. 4.

3. Gell. III 3, 14: Saturnionem et Addictum et tertiam quandam .. in pistrino eum scripsisse Varro et plerique alii memoriae tradiderunt, cum, pecunia omni quam in operis artificum scenicorum pepererat in mercatibus perdita, inops Romam rediisset et ob quaerendum victum ad circumagendas molas quae trusatiles appellantur operam pistori locasset. Hieronym. l. l.: qui propter annonae difficultatem ad molas manuarias pistori sese locaverat, ibi quotiens ab opere vacaret scribere fabulas solitus ac vendere. Hor. Ep. II 1, 175 maintains that Plautus is a careless writer, because gestit enim nummum in loculos demittere.

4. Gell. III 3, 11: feruntur sub Plauti nomine comoediae circiter centum atque triginta. Serv. praef. ad comm. in Aen.: Plautum alii dicunt viginti et unam fabulas scripsisse, alii quadraginta, alii centum. The last number may, perhaps, have come from a different source, as M. Hertz proposes; Ritschl, Par. p. 126. 173 thinks differently. Indices (of the Plautine plays) by Aelius, Sedigitus, Claudius, Aurelius, Attius and Manilius are mentioned by Gellius l. l. § 1; ib. 12: homo eruditissimus L. Aelius XXV eius (Plauti) esse solas existimavit. Of Varro we are told ib. 1 sqq. that he distinguished his classes according to his personal feeling and judgment, as to whether a play was worthy of Plautus or not: (3) nam praeter illas XXI quae Varronianae vocantur, quas idcirco a ceteris segregavit, quoniam dubiosae non erant, sed consensu omnium Plauti esse censebantur, quasdam item alias probavit, adductus filo atque facetia, sermonis Plauto congruentis, easque iam nominibus aliorum occupatas Plauto vindicavit. Ritschl conjectures that Varro put 19 plays in this second class (ἀντιλεγόμενα) and thus explains the number 40 in Servius, perhaps (p. 128 sqq.) 22. Saturio, 23. Addictus, 24. Boeotia, 25. Nervolaria, 26. Fretum, 27. Trigemini, 28. Astraba, 29. Parasitus piger, 30. Parasitus medicus, 31. Commorientes, 32. Condalium, 33. Gemini lenones, 34. Feneratrix, 35. Frivolaria, 36. Sitellitergus, 37. Fugitivi, 38. Cacistio, 39. Hortulus, 40. Artemo. To the 3rd class (νόθα) may then belong (p. 154 sqq.): 1. Colax, 2. Carbonaria, 3. Acharistio, 4. Bis compressa, 5. Anus, 6. Agroceus, 7. Dyscolus, 8. Phagon? 9. Cornicula, 10. Calceolus, 11. Baccaria, 12. Caecus aut Praedones. But that the 21 (only the last, Vidularia,

is lost) which we still have are the Varronianae (of the first class, the ὁμολογούμενα) is of itself highly probable. Varro's authority brought it to pass that the plays acknowledged by him were treated with preference in copying and reading.

5. The origin of the critical difficulty appears from Gell. III 3, 13: non dubium est quin istae (all?) quae scriptae a Plauto non videntur et nomini eius addicuntur veterum poetarum fuerint et ab eo retractatae atque expolitae sint ac propterea resipiant stilum Plautinum. This might apply only to plays of Andronicus and Naevius; see Ritschl Par. p. 96—113. In § 10 Gellius mentions also in Varronis liber de comoediis plautinis id quoque scriptum, Plautium fuisse quempiam poetam comoediarum, whose plays had been mixed up with those of Plautus on account of the similarity of the names (Gen. Plauti), but this does not help us much: see Ritschl p. 95 sq. The principal cause is (Ritschl p. 113 sq.): that the name "Plautine" became a kind of collective appellation of the principal period of the palliata, the anonymous plays being put to the account of a famous name, or also the managers intentionally ascribing them to Plautus. Comp. Mommsen H. R. I² p. 882. There seems to have in Rome about the time of Plautus a not insignificant number of such professional comic writers; but as they did not publish their plays under their own names, they have been completely forgotten [and Plautius would be a forgotten poet of this class]; and whatever survived of these plays, was afterwards attributed to the most popular of these poets.

6. On the whole question see Ritschl, the fab. Varronianae of Plautus, Par. p. 71—245.

85. The 20 extant plays are arranged in the mss. in nearly alphabetical order, which has however been departed from in the case of the Bacchides in favour of chronological order. The following list contains their names according to the usual arrangement:

1) Amphitruo, the only Plautine play with a mythological (comic-marvellous) plot, of somewhat doubtful morality, but treated with complete mastery over the language and with sparkling humour. Its original and the time of its composition are unknown.

The frivolous way in which the virtue of the faithful and noble Alcmene is played with is not commendable. There are similar confusions of persons as in the Menaechmi, though here owing to intentional imitation. On account of the mixture of divine and human characters the play is denoted as tragicomoedia in the prologus. The original belongs no doubt to the New Comedy, and was neither a play of Archippus (old Attic Comedy) nor of Rhinthon; see J. Vahlen, Rh. Mus. XVI p. 472 sqq. It was perhaps performed as late as the fourth and fifth century of the Christian era, see Arnob. adv. g. IV 35.

VII 34. Prudent. peristr. X 226. Augustin. Epist. 202. After IV 2 there is a gap of about 4 scenes or 300 lines, caused by the loss of a quaternio; in the 15th century this was filled up by Hermolaus Barbarus in a manner very unsuccessful both as to form and contents.

Editions by F. Ast (Landshut 1818), Lindemann (Lips. 1834), F. W. Holtze (Lips. 1846).

F. Osann, on the Amph. of Plautus, Rh. Mus. ed. by Welcker and Näke II p. 305—335. E. Hoffmann, de Plauti Amph. exemplari et fragmentis, Bresl. 1848. Welcker, Greek Trag. p. 1478—1481.

2) Asinaria, with a farcical plot, but varied and lively characters and scenes of great comic power. It is probably taken from Diphilus' Ὀναγός, and seems to have been written c. 560.

Instead of Demophilus scripsit in the prologue Ladewig and Ritschl, Par. p. 272 note, write: eam Diphilus scripsit.

Edition by E. J. Richter, Nürnberg 1833. — Linge, de As. Plauti, insigni corruptae apud Atticos sub novae comoediae aevum puerorum educationis exemplo. Hirschberg 1834.

3) Aulularia, one of the best plays of Plautus, both in plot and in execution, containing the portrait of a miser in a number of various situations. The conclusion is lost.

The original was no doubt a play of the New Comedy. On account of III 5 it must have been written after the abolition of the lex Oppia, i. e. after 559; Ladewig in Ztschrf. f. d. AW. 1841 p. 1085 sq.

Editions by Göller (Cologne 1825), E. J. Richter (Nürnb. 1833), Deenik (Leyden 1835), Hildyard (London 1839), Th. Vallauri (Turin 1853), W. Wagner (with notes, Cambridge 1866).

Wolff, prolegomena ad Pl. A., Naumburg 1836. 4. Bromig, the A. of Pl. compared with Molière's Avare, Burgsteinfurt 1854. 4. C. Humbert, Molière's A. and Pl.'s A., in Herrig's Archiv XVIII p. 376—410. G. Claus, de Aul. Pl. fabula iisque scriptoribus qui eam imitati sunt, Stettin 1862. 74 pp. 8. W. Wagner, de Pl. A. Bonn 1864. 34 pp. 8.

4) Captivi, a sentimental piece without a love-intrigue or much interest, though there are some pretty scenes, and the whole is enlivened by the character of the parasite.

Contamination (the principal part belonging to Anaxandrides, the parasite to Antiphanes) has been maintained by Ladewig, on the 'canon' of Volc. Sedigitus (1842) p. 28—31, but without satisfactory reasons; he almost withdraws his theory in Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 1733.

Editions by Avellini (Naples 1807. 4.), Bosscha (Amsterd. 1817), Fr. Lindemann (em. Lips. 1830; with Mil. gl. and Trinummus, Lips. 1823. 1844), C. E. Geppert (Lat. and Germ., Berlin 1859), J. Brix (for schools, (Leipzig 1865. 1870).

Lessing, Works III p. 77—122. 127—140. Comp. W. Hertzberg's pref. to his translation p. XIX. — J. Brix, Emendationes in Pl. Captivos, Liegnitz 1862. 22 pp. 4.

5) Curculio, the comical name of the parasite in the play. The characters are the same as usual, the plot insignificant. It seems to have been composed soon after 561.

IV 2, 23 sqq. allusion to the lex Sempronia (Liv. XXXV 7) of the year 561. W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. VIII p. 33. Besides IV 2, a kind of parabasis in IV 1 is remarkable.

Edition by C. E. Geppert (Lat. and Germ.) Berlin 1845. Lindemann, scena Pl. ex Curc. emendata, Zittau 1845. 4. L Mercklin, Symbolae exeget. ad Curc. Pl., ind. lect. Dorpat 1861. 14 pp. 4.

6) Casina, adapted from the *Κληρούμενοι* of Diphilus, though with the addition of obscenities in coarse Roman taste, which may also have caused the loss of the concluding scenes. The extant play is no doubt an abridgement made for later performances, but the author of the prologue was evidently acquainted with the complete play.

W. Teuffel Rh. Mus. VIII p. 27—30. Mommsen H. R. I² p. 873 (note) concludes from V 4, 11 that the play was written before the prohibition of the Bacchanals, against Ritschl Par. p. 191 sqq.

The theatre-ticket with the inscription 'Casina Plauti' reported to have been found at Pompeii is spurious.

Edition (in us. lectt.) by Geppert, Berlin 1866. — Th. Ladewig, Introd. and notes to the Casina, Rh. Mus. III p. 185 sqq. Th. Mommsen, on the prol. to the Cas. ibid. X p. 122—127. On Cas. III 5 see A. Fleckeisen, Krit. Miscellen (Dresden 1864) p. 5 sqq. Geppert, on the Cas. in the cod. Ambros. Mützell's Ztschrf. f. GW. XVII p. 625—636. W. Studemund, ib. XVIII p. 526—558.

7) Cistellaria, scarcely one half of which is preserved, perhaps also from a stage-edition. The plot is very much like that of the Epidicus. Written perhaps c. 555.

W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. VIII p. 30—32.

Edition by L. E. Benoist, Lyon 1863. — Th. Ladewig, Introd. and notes to the Cist., Rh. Mus. III p. 520 sqq.

8) Epidicus, the plot varied, but somewhat complicated, and without much humour and vivacity. It must have been written after 589.

The complicated plot may perhaps be explained (according to Ladewig Ztschfr. f. AW. 1841 p. 1086—1090, but against him R. Müller, p. 5—14) by assuming contamination, and may itself account for the

poet's predilection for this play (Bacch. II 2, 36). — II 2, 40 sqq. presupposes the abolition (a. 559) of the lex Oppia sumptuaria.

Editions by Fr. Jacob (Lübeck 1835) and C. E. Geppert, Berlin 1865. — R. Müller, de Pl. Epidico, Berlin 1865.

9) Bacchides, one of the best plays both in plan and execution. The first scenes have been lost with the last part of the Aulularia. The original was most likely Menander's Δὶς ἐξαπατῶν. It was performed a. 565.

On the contents of the 2 or 3 scenes which are lost see Ritschl, Rh. Mus. IV p. 354—376. 561—610. The bad supplements found in old editions are most probably by Antonio Beccadelli of Palermo.

Contamination is not probable: see W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. VIII p. 26 sq. In IV 9, 149 sq. we find an allusion to the four triumphs of a. 565.

Editions by F. Ritschl (Halle 1835) and G. Hermann (Lips. 1845).

Separate treatises (besides the important one by Ritschl previously quoted): F. V. Fritzsche, program of Rostock 1846. 7 pp. 4. Schneidewin, on I 2, Rh. Mus. II p. 415—427. M. H. E. Meier, Halle 1853. 4. = Opusc. II p. 330—336.

10) Mostellaria (the haunted house), a play with a well-contrived plot and a variety of well-drawn characters.

Probably adapted from Philemon's Φάσμα, Ritschl Par. p. 159 sq. 272 note.

Ritschl, de turbato scenarum ordine Most. Pl., Parerga p. 431—508. J. A. Stamkart, commentarius in Pl. Most., Amsterdam 1858. 128 pp. 8.

Explained by A. O. Fr. Lorenz, Berlin 1866. [Posthumous edition by W. Ramsay, London 1869.]

11) Menaechmi, in all probability the most excellent of the Plautine comedies, describing the merry mistakes and complications arising from the very great resemblance of twins. The original and time of this play are unknown.

Argumentum sicelissat (prol. 12) is said with reference to the place only. It is very doubtful whether Posidippus' Δίδυμοι was the original (Ladewig, Philol. I p. 275 sqq.): see Rh. Mus. VIII p. 33 sq. The passage II 3, 60 furnishes no safe argument to fix the time (perhaps before 539).

Critical contributions by J. Vahlen, Rh. Mus. XVI p. 631—638. W. Teuffel, Jahn's Jahrb. 93 p. 704. 95 p. 32—34. 273 sq. Rh. Mus. XXII p. 451—455.

W. Claus, on Plautus' Mostellaria and the imitations of it, espec. Shakespeare's Comedy of Errors, Stettin 1861. 48 pp. 4.

Editions by Hildyard (Cantabr. 1840), Geppert (Latin and Germ.), Berl. 1845, J. Brix (for schools, Leipzig 1866).

12) Miles gloriosus, the exaggerated portrait of a braggadocio, not without prolix passages, but on the whole well-planned and humorously executed.

The traditional title is defended against Fleckeisen (Rh. Mus. XIV p. 628 sq. note) by W. Hertzberg in his Translation p. 356 sq., and A. Riese Rh. Mus. XXII p. 303 sq.

The original of the play, according to II 1, 8, is the Ἀλαζών of some Greek poet, and in the introductory scene also Menander's Κόλαξ (acc. to W. A. Becker), or Diphilus' Ἀρπαγιστείχης (acc. to Ritschl). See Rh. Mus. VIII p. 34.

The time is later than a. 550 (on account of v. 211 sq.) and earlier than 568 (on acc. of 1016).

Editions by Danz (Vimar. 1804), Lindemann (em. Lips. 1827; with Capt. and Trin. 1823. 1844), Vallauri (Turin 1855). [Lorenz, Berlin 1869.]

Ritschl, scena Plaut. emend., Bresl. 1839. 4. Program of Bonn, summer 1849. On the old argumentum of the Mil. gl., Bonn 1841. 4. Excursuses, Rh. M. VII p. 314 sqq. F. V. Fritzsche, Rostock program, Summer 1850. M. Haupt, Berlin program, summer 1858. O. Ribbeck, Rh. Mus. XII p. 594—611. A. Schöne, ibid. XVIII p. 157—162.

13) Mercator, with a plot resembling the Casina, probably performed not before 559. Its original was Philemon's Ἔμπορος.

The time has been concluded from III 1, 28 by Ladewig, Ztschrf. f. AW. 1841 p. 1085; comp. Ritschl, Par. p. 344.

Critical contributions by E. J. Brix, Philol. XII p. 650—657. F. Bücheler, Rh. Mus. XV p. 428—444.

14) Pseudolus (Ψευδόλος), a mature production in its whole character and form, performed a. 563.

On the title Pseudolus, see O. Seyffert, Philol. XXV p. 448 sq. note. On the change of a Greek *v* into Latin o see Fleckeisen Jahrb. 93 p. 9—12.

The first performance took place on the consecration of the temple of the magna mater (cf. II 4, 19), according to the didascalia: (Ritschl Par. p. 286. 295). Comp. Cic. Cato 14, 50: quam (gaudebat in senectute) Truculento Plautus, quam Pseudulo! — Bergk maintains that this comedy was an adaptation of a play of the Middle Comedy: Rh. Mus. XX p. 290.

Annot. instr. Romeijn, Daventr. 1836. — With Rud. and Truc. denuo rec. et expl. F. H. Bothe, Lips. 1840. — H. Usener, Pseud. Plaut. scaena secunda recognita, Greifswald progr. 1866. 18 pp. 4.

15) Poenulus, not without blemishes in its plot and division, but famous for the Phoenician passage in it. It was performed 565. Its original was a play called *Καρχηδόνιος*, probably by Menander.

On the faults and chronology of this play see W. Teuffel, Rhein. Mus. VIII p. 35—37. At a later performance the title was changed to Patruus pultiphagonides (prol. 54). The last scene exists in two texts, not agreeing with each other, but of about the same age. Ritschl's Par. p. 601.

Edition by Geppert, Berol 1864. — On the Punic see the programs by Bellermann (Berlin 1806—1808), E. Lindemann (Schneeberg 1833 sq. 1837), Wex (Schwerin 1838), F. C. Movers, Phoenician texts, I. Berl. 1845. Wex Rh. Mus. II p. 130 sqq. IX p. 312—315. XII p. 627—630. F. Hitzig, ibid. X p. 77—109. [A. Neubauer, Journal of Philology II p. 324 sqq.]

16) Persa, a play describing the intrigues of slaves, with a simple plot, which is, however, in some respect carried out in a very lively manner. The time is probably a. V. C. 558.

Th. Ladewig, on the canon of Volc. Sed. p. 38—40.

17) Rudens (the Cable), remarkable rather for the merry and witty execution of many scenes than the plot of the whole. Time about 562.

W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. VIII p. 37 sq. — Editions by F. V. Reiz (Lips. 1789), C. E. Chr. Schneider (Vratisl. 1824), F. H. Bothe (see Pseud.), Geppert (Berlin 1846: see Ritschl, Rh. Mus. V p. 128 sqq.), E. Benoist (Paris 1864). — Kampmann, adnott., Oels 1830. 4.

18) Stichus, performed 544, ludis plebeis. The original was Menander's *Φιλάδελφοι*, though with the conclusion changed.

Ritschl Par. p. 261—280. Bergk, Ztschfr. f. AW. 1850 p. 332 sq. W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. VIII p. 38—40. Dziatzko, ib. XXI p. 82 sq.

19) Trinummus, a family piece, without female characters, of measured plan and tone. Exhibited not before 560. The original was Philemon's *Θησαυρός*.

Editions by G. Hermann (Lips. 1800), Göller (Colon. 1824), Lindemann (em., Lips. 1830; with Capt. and Mil. 1823. 1844), Geppert (Latin and German, Berlin 1844. Leipzig 1854), Th. Vallauri (Turin 1856), J. Brix (for schools, Leipzig 1864).

Ritschl, de actae Trin. tempore, Par. p. 339—354. De interpolatione Trin., ibid. p. 511—579. Grauert, Allgem. Schulztg. 1829, nr. 4—6. M. H. E. Meier, de Pl. Tr., Opusc. II p. 321—329. Vollbehr, de Tr., Rendsburg 1862. 16 pp. 4. Bergk, Marburg progr., 1849 sq. 12 pp.

4. F. V. Fritzsche, Rostock progr., 1849 sq. W. Studemund, the Plautine Trin. in the cod. Ambrosianus, Rh. Mus. XXI p. 574—621.

20) Truculentus, performed about 564 V. C., full of broad and unrestrained humour. The principal character is a meretrix.

W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. VIII p. 40 sq. Cic. Cato 14, 50.

Editions by C. E. Chr. Schneider (Vratisl. 1834. 4.), Göller (Colon. 1824), F. H. Bothe (see Pseud.), Geppert (Berol. 1863), A. Spengel (ed., illustr., Gott. 1868). — A. Spengel, lect. Plaut. Munich 1868. 8 pp. 4.

21) Vidularia, being the last play of this series, was lost in the middle ages. [Treatise on it by Studemund, Gryphisv. 1870]

Querolus s. Aulularia, in prose, of the 3rd or 4th century, edited by P. Daniel (Paris 1564), Klinkhamer (Amsterd. 1829). The subjects of this play and of Plautus' Amphitruo were also treated in elegiac verses by Vitalis de Blois (Blesensis) in the 12th century; edited by Osann, Darmstadt 1836.

86. In the beginning of the 15th century only the first 8 plays were known and circulated in numerous mss., while the last 12 had disappeared. Of these a ms. was found about 1428 in Germany (the cod. Vrsinianus at present in the Vatican Library), and in the 16th century were found the two mss. of Camerarius, the Vetus containing all the plays, and the so-called Decurtatus containing only the last 12. In the course of the 15th century, in Italy, probably by order of Alfonso I of Naples (after 1435) and perhaps by Antonius of Palermo, a text of these 20 plays was made in conformity with the requirements and taste of the time, in a very arbitrary and ignorant manner, with innumerable changes, conjectures, and interpolations, and this was spread in many copies. One of the earliest of these interpolated mss. is the cod. Vindobonensis of the year 1443, at the same time the most correct together with the cod. Lipsiensis. Comp. Ritschl, Rh. Mus. IV (1836) p. 153—180; and on the mss. of Camerarius ib p. 514 sqq. 535 sqq. [also in his Opuscula vol. II].

All these mss. which are based on the text of one and the same grammarian (perhaps Calliopius), differ from the palimpsest (cod. Ambros.), discovered by A. Mai a. 1815 in the Ambrosian library at Milan, which in spite of its want of 7 pieces and the fragmentary manner in which the others are preserved, gives of these a text more original and less corrupt. Comp. A. Mai, M. Acci Plauti fragmenta inedita etc., Mediol. 1815 (also in Osann Anal. crit. p. 205—228). F. Ritschl, Ztschfr. f. AW. 1837, n. 91—93 and chapters I, VI and VII of the Prolegomena to the Trinummus. Geppert, on the Ambrosian ms. and its influence on the criticism of Plautus, Leipzig 1847. W. Studemund, Rh. Mus. XXI p. 574—579.

A critical history of the editions and texts of Plautus down to Bothe, by Ritschl, Rh. Mus. IV (1836) p. 180—216. 485—570. The first

edition of the first 8 plays is s. l. et a. Of the complete Plautus ed. princeps cura Georg. Merulae, Venet. 1472 fol. (the last 7 plays from an uninterpolated copy of the cod. Vrsin.); a revision by Merula's pupils, Eusebius Scutarius, Mediol. 1490. fol., Ven. 1495. 4°. — Venet. 1499 fol. by Bernard. Saracenus. — c. interpret. I. Bapt. Pii, Mediol. 1500. fol. (from his commentary dates the modern division into acts). A new text by Pylades Buccardus of Brescia, Bresciae 1506. fol. His text, though interpolated and mutilated, became through the Aldine (Ven. 1522) the vulgate until Joach. Camerarius, whose complete edition appeared at Basle 1552. Lambinus' commentary (and text) was after his death edited by J. Helias, Lutetiae 1576. Fr. Taubmann's commentary appeared at Witenberg 1605, and again 1612 with fuller notes from the mss. of Camerarius (which had meanwhile been transferred to the Heidelberg library), the best edition is ex recognitione Iani Gruteri 1621. 4. — Ed. J. Ph. Pareus, Francofurti 1610. 8.; with the various readings of the Heidelberg mss. Neapoli Nemetum (i. e. Neustadt in the Palatinate) 1619. 4. = Francofurti 1623. 4., and Francof. 1641. 8. without the various readings, but with a fuller collection of the fragments. — The vulgate until Ritschl was the edition of J. Fr. Gronovius (Lugd. Bat. 1664. 1669. 1684; c. praef. Ernesti, Lips. 1760. 2 vol. 8.). — Ed. Fr. H. Bothe, Berol. 1809—1811. 4 voll. 8., and Poetae scenici latini (Halberstadt 1821), vol. I and II = Stuttgart 1829 sq. 4 voll. — rec., interpr. est C. H. Weise, Quedlinb. 1837. 1847. 2 voll. and in the Tauchnitz collection, ed. nova 1866. — ex recognitione A. Fleckeiseni, Lips. Teubner 1859. 2 voll. (10 plays). — Of the greatest importance: ex rec. et cum apparatu critico Fr. Ritschelii. Tom. I (Prolegomena, Trinummus, Mil. Bacch.) Bonn 1848 sq. II (Stich. Pseud. Men. Most.) 1850 sq. III (Persa, Merc. ? ?) 1853 sqq., the text alone being also separately issued. See A. Fleckeisen in Jahn's Jahrb. LX p. 234—263. LXI p. 17—66. Th. Bergk, Ztschfr. f. AW. 1848 p. 1129 sqq. His edition is now in course of republication.

[The best English translation is by Bonnell Thornton and Richard Warner, London 1769 sqq., 5 voll. Among the French translations that by M. de Marolles should be mentioned, as it contains also the text of Plautus revised by Fr. Guyet, an ingenious critic of the 17th century.]

Contributions to Plautine criticism: e. g. by A. Fleckeisen, Exercitationes Plautinae, Gött. 1842, Plautine Analecta, Philol. II (1847) p. 57—114, Critical Miscellanea (Progr. of the Vitzthum Gymnasium at Dresden, 1864), Plautine observations, in the Jahrb. 95 p. 625—637. J. Brix, Emendationes Plautinae, Hirschberg 1854. 4. Th. Bergk, Ztschfr. f. AW. 1855, n. 37 sq.; programs of the Halle University in 1858. 1866, Philol. XVII p. 38—58 etc. M. Crain, Philol. IX p. 646—678, progr. of Putbus 1858. 4., Berl. Ztschfr. f. GW. 1866 p. 471—485. 867—870. 1867, p. 148—154. Th. Ladewig, Philol. XVII p. 248—269. 452—480. C. Kretschmer, Quaestiones Pl., Breslau 1863. 32 pp. 8. Andr. Spengel, T. Maccius Plautus: the criticism, prosody and metres

of his works, Gött. 1865. 240 pp. 8. K. H. Weise, the comedies of Plautus, critically considered in their form and plots with regard to the genuine and spurious parts, Quedlinb. 1866. 189 pp. 8. O. Seyffert, contributions to Plautine criticism, Philol. XXV p. 439—670. A. Kiessling, Plautine Miscellanea, in the Symbola philolog. Bonn. p. 833—840. [Above all, the various treatises contained in the second vol. of Ritschl's Opuscula, and his New Plautine Excursuses, Leipzig 1869.]

87. Plautus is exclusively a comic poet, nay a popular poet with all the good and bad qualities of such a one. Though he borrows his plots from Greek literature — where indeed Diphilus and Philemon seem to have possessed greater attraction for him than the refined Menander — he is himself so full of his own ideas that he constantly deserts his originals and brings in his own jokes. The difference of culture between the two nations likewise necessitated a coarser sketching. Personal allusions do not seem to occur among his own additions [except the one to Naevius]; but he often criticises the tendencies and circumstances of his own time in a severe and cutting manner. He is not always very particular as to probability, and his plays are often loosely planned. His jokes are often coarse, but rarely insipid, and he avoids sentimentality. In language and style, his plays stand midway between the old national Saturnian metre and the Greeks: with the first he shares a fondness for alliterative composition, a prosodiacal looseness (espec. with regard to his frequent neglect of the laws of position), and perhaps also a certain indifference in point of hiatus; but with the latter he has in common the measures and the general rules as to their treatment. Plautus handles them in the easy manner of the old dramatists, though with great mastery and frequently with real harmonious effect. In point of language, his plays form one of the most important documents for the history of the Latin language.

1. On the character of Plautus see espec. Mommsen, H. R. I² p. 881—883. W. Hertzberg's introd. to his translation, espec. p. XXVIII sq. XXXII sqq. Th. Ladewig, in Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 1728—1739. The plays are singly reviewed in Rh. Mus. New Series VIII p. 51—69, in M. Rapp's History of the Greek drama (Tüb. 1862) p. 302—365, and in J. L. Klein's History of the drama II (Leipzig 1865) p. 492—566.

2. Among the ancients Cicero is extravagant in his admiration (in ascribing to Plautus, Offic. I 29, 104, the iocandi genus elegans, urbanum, ingeniosum, facetum in equal perfection with the Attic poets;

Sidon. Apoll. XXIII 148 even says Graios, Plaute, sales lepore transis), while Horace is too severe in his criticism (judging from artistic rules) Ep. II 1, 170 sqq. 3, 270 sqq. In the Augustan period the admirers of the archaic poets praised him for his vivacity and rapidity for which they compared him to Epicharmus; on the frequently misunderstood expression properare ad exemplar Epicharmi (Hor. Ep. II 1, 57 sq.) see Th. Ladewig, on the canon of Volc. Sed. (1842) p. 19—26 and Philol. I p. 276—285, and also Linge, de Plauto properante ad ex. Ep., Ratibor 1827. 4. For properare cf. espec. Aristoph. Eccl. 583: ὡς τὸ ταχύνειν χαρίτων μετέχει πλεῖστον παρὰ τοῖσι θεαταῖς.

3. Chronology of the comedies. Köpke's introd. to his translation p. XIII sqq. Windischmann, Rh. Mus. I p. 110 sqq. F. Ritter, Allgem. Schulztg. 1830 p. 873 sqq. Petersen, Ztschfr. f. AW. 1836 p. 615 sqq. Naudet in the Journal des Savants 1838 p. 330 sqq. Vissering, Quaest. Plaut. I (Amsterdam 1842) p. 94 sqq. Ritschl Par. I p. 117 sq. 353 sq.

4. His treatment of his Greek originals: W. A. Becker, de com. rom. maxime Plaut. quaestiones (Lips. 1837) p. 82 sqq. Ritschl, Par. p. 271 sqq. Fr. V. Fritzsche, de graecis fontibus Plauti, I. Rostock 1845. 4. G. Boissier, quomodo graecos poetas Plautus transtulerit, Paris 1857. Fr. Schultz, Plautus and his relation to the middle and New Attic comedy, Neustadt in Pr., 1866. 24 pp. 8.

5. He abounds in terms of abuse etc.: see P. Langen, de exsecrandi formulis Plautinis Terentianisque, Rh. Mus. XII p. 426—433.

6. Allusions of a military and juridical nature are very frequent. Kampmann, res militares Pl., Breslau 1839. Romeijn, loca nonnulla ex Pl. com. iure civili illustrata, Daventr. 1836. E. I. Bekker, de emtione venditione quae Plauti fabulis fuisse probetur, Berlin 1853, and loci Plautini de rebus creditis, Greifswald 1861. 25 pp. 4. G. Demelius, Plautine studies, Ztschfr. für Rechtsgesch. by Rudorff, Bruns etc. I (1862) p. 351—372. II p. 177—238. See above 38, 3.

7. Delineation of characters. L. E. Benoist, de personis muliebribus apud Pl., Marseille 1862. 77 pp. 8.

8. Language. Törnerös, de ingenio sermonis Pl., Upsala 1833. Kampmann, de AB praep. usu Pl., Breslau 1842. de IN praep. usu Pl. 1845. F. Lübker, de usu infinitivi Pl., Schleswig 1841 = Ztschfr. f. AW. 1849, n. 14—16. F. Umpfenbach, meletemata Plautina, Giessen 1860. 67 pp. 8. (de med et ted accusativis, p. 3—47. de iussivo temporis praeteriti p. 48 sqq.). F. Ritschl, Plautinische Excurse, Rh. Mus. New Series VII—XII. Neue Plautinische Excurse I (on D final in archaic Latin). Fr. Schultz, de obsoletis coniugationum Plaut. formis, Conitz 1864. 23 pp. 4. H. Bocksch, de casuum quam dicunt attractione ap. Pl. et Ter. Breslau 1865. 41 pp. 8. G. Schmilinski, de proprietate sermonis Pl. usu linguarum romanicarum illustrata, Halle 1866. 48 pp. 8. F. W. Holtze, Syntaxis priscorum script. lat. usque ad Terentium. I. II. Lips. 1861 sq. 426 and 396 pp. 8. E. Lübbert, grammatical Studies. I Breslau 1867. II, 1870.

9. Prosody and metres. Linge, de hiatu in vers. Pl. Breslau 1817. J. Brix, de et Ter. prosodia, Breslau 1841. E. Kärcher, Prosodiacal observations on Pl. and Ter., Carlsruhe 1846. R. Enger, the prosody of Pl., Ostrowo 1852. 4. W. Corssen, Vocalismus etc., the second part. Brix's introd. to his edition of the Trinummus, W. Wagner's introd. to his Aulularia and in the Rh. Mus. XXII p. 422—438; and espec. Ritschl, Rh. Mus. XIV (1859) p. 394—407. Perhaps his preference for the trochaic tetrameter was due to the study of Epicharmus; Vahlen, Rh. Mus. XIV p. 475.

10. F. V. Fritzsche, de canticis Pl. I. Rostock 1861. 8 pp. 4. W. Studemund, de canticis Pl., Halle 1863. 94 pp. 8. See A. Spengel, Eos I p. 606—609. M. Crain, on the composition of the Plautine Cantica, Berlin 1865. 53 pp. 8. A. Spengel, de versuum creticorum usu plautino, Berlin 1861. O. Seyffert, de bacchiacorum versuum usu pl., Berlin 1864. 48 pp. 8.

11. On an old Plautine glossary see W. Hertzberg, Archive of Philology VII p. 275 sqq. Ritschl, Bonn index, Summer 1846. 10 pp. 4. — Lexicon Plautinum, by L. Evans. London 1853.

88. The Plautine plays maintained themselves on the stage for a long time after the poet's death, and most of the prologues were written for performances at the beginning of the seventh century V. C. His works became also at an early time the subjects of learned labours, with regard both to the language and the explanation of the subject-matter, and here Varro's labours were prominent.

1. The Prologues. Ritschl, Par. I p. 180—238. W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. VIII p. 26; Jahn's Jahrb. 95 p. 32 sq. A. L. R. Liebig, de prologis Terentianis et Plautinis, Görlitz 1859. 50 pp. 4. C. Dziatzko, de prol. Pl. et Ter. quaestiones selectae, Bonn 1864. 38 pp. 8; on the Plautine prologues, leading principles, Lucern 1867. 16 pp. 4.

2. Of the metrical arguments the acrostichs (preserved in all the plays except the Bacchides) belong perhaps to the 7th century V. C. (Aurelius Opilius), the non-acrostichs probably to the time of the Antonines (of them we have five). Ritschl's proll. to the Trin. p. 316—320. F. Osann, Ztschfr. f. AW. 1849, n. 26 sqq.

3. F. Ritschl, de veteribus Plauti interpretibus, in his Par. I p. 357 — 387.

4. Lists (indices) of the plays of Plautus were, according to Gell. III 3, 1, made by Aelius (Stilo), Volcatius Sedigitus, Serv. Claudius, Aurelius Opilius, L. Attius, Manilius and Varro.

5. Detailed points of the language of Plautus were commented on by the glossographers Aurelius Opilius, Ser. Claudius, Aelius Stilo, Flavius Caper, Aruntius Celsus.

6. Real commentators of Plautus were L. Cornelius Sisenna and (under Hadrian) Terentius Scaurus. Ritschl, Par. p. 374 sqq.

7. For Varro's works on Plautus see below the article on Varro.

89. Q. Ennius, born 515 = 139 at Rudiae in the country of the Peucetians, where the Greek and Oscan elements were greatly mixed, served in the Roman army a. 450 in Sardinia, when M. Porcius Cato fell in with him and took him to Rome. Here he gained his livelihood by giving instruction in Greek and making translations of Greek plays for the Roman stage, and also won the favour of Scipio the Elder by a panegyric on him, entitled Scipio. M. Fulvius Nobilior, Cos. 565, took Ennius with him into his province Aetolia, as a witness and herald of his deeds. His son obtained for the poet the Roman citizenship a. 570 by giving him a lot at Potentia with the approval of the people, when he had been appointed triumvir coloniae deducendae. Ennius died of gout a. 585.

1. The year of his birth is attested by Varro, ap. Gell. N. A. XVI 21, 43: comp. Cic. Brut. 18, 72 sq. Tusc. I 1, 3. — Strab. VI p. 281 Cas.: *Ῥοδίαι, πόλις ἑλληνὶς ἐξ ἧς ἦν ὁ ποιητὴς Ἔννιος.* Mela II 4, 61. Sil. Ital. XII 393 sqq. Auson. Id. XII (grammaticom. 17) and others. Calabrae Pierides, Hor. O. IV 8, 20, cf. Ovid. A. A. III 409. Suid. v. *Ἔννιος· ποιητὴς Μεσσάπιος.* Fest. v. solitaur. p. 293 M.: quam consuetudinem (non geminandi litteras in scribendo) Ennius mutavisse fertur, utpote Graecus graeco more usus. Suet. gramm. 1: antiquissimi doctorum qui iidem et poetae et semigraeci erant, Livium et Ennium dico etc. Gell. XVII 17, 1: Q. Ennius tria corda habere sese dicebat, quod loqui graece et osce et latine sciret.

2. Corn. Nep. Cato 1, 4: praetor provinciam obtinuit Sardiniam, ex qua quaestor superiore tempore ex Africa decedens Q. Ennium poetam deduxerat. Comp. Jerome ad Euseb. Chron. Ol. 135, 1 = 515 V. C.: Q. Ennius poeta Tarenti (a mistake) nascitur, qui a Catone quaestore Romam translatus habitavit in monte Aventino (cf. Varro L. L. V 34, 163: .. ligionem Porcius, viz. Licinus, designat quom de Ennio scribens dicit eum coluisse Tutilinae loca), parco admodum sumptu contentus et unius (? comp. Cic. de or. II 68, 276) ancillae ministerio. Fr. Ritter, Ztschfr. f. A. W. 1840 p. 370.

3. Cic. p. Arch. 9, 22: carus fuit Africano superiori noster Ennius; itaque etiam in sepulcro Scipionum putatur is esse constitutus ex marmore. Liv. XXXVIII 56: Romae extra portam Capenam in Scipionum monumento tres statuae sunt, quarum duae P. et L. Scipionum dicuntur esse, tertia poetae Q. Ennii. Comp. Welcker, Trag. p. 1360. — For his familiar relations with Scipio Nasica see Cic. de or. II 68, 276.

4. Cic. p. Arch. 11, 27: ille qui cum Aetolis Ennio comite bellavit Fulvius. Tusc. I 2, 3: oratio Catonis, in qua obiecit ut probrum M. Nobiliori quod is in provinciam poetas duxisset. duxerat autem consul ille in Aetoliam, ut scimus, Ennium. Aur. Vict. illustr. 52, 3: quam victoriam (of Fulvius over the Aetolians) per se magnificam Q. Ennius, amicus eius, insigni laude celebravit.

5. Cic. p. Arch. 10, 22: ergo illum ... Rudinum hominem, maiores nostri in civitatem receperunt. Brut. 20, 79: Q. Nobiliorem M. f. ..., qui etiam Q. Ennium, qui cum patre eius in Aetolia militaverat (this is, however, inaccurate), civitate donavit, cum triumvir coloniam deduxisset. Liv. XXXIX 44: eodem anno (570 V. C.) coloniae duae, Potentia in Picenum, Pisaurum in gallicum agrum, deductae sunt ... diviserunt agrum coloniasque deduxerunt iidem triumviri, Q. Fabius Labeo et M. et Q. Fulvii, Flaccus et Nobilior. Comp. Fr. Ritter l. l. p. 383—385. This explains Ennius' line: nos sumus Romani qui fuvimus ante Rudini, Cic. de or. III 42, 168.

6. Cic. Cato mai. 5, 14: annos septuaginta natus — tot enim vixit Ennius — ita ferebat duo quae maxima putantur onera, paupertatem et senectutem, ut eis paene delectari videretur. Brut. 20, 78: hoc (C. Sulpicio Gallo) praetore ludos Apollini faciente, cum Thyesten fabulam docuisset, Q. Marcio Cn. Servilio coss. (585 = 169) mortem obiit Ennius. Jerome ad Euseb. chr. Ol. 153, 1: Ennius poeta septuagenario maior articulari morbo perit (comp. Ennius ap. Prisc. VIII p. 829 P. numquam poetor nisi si podager: cf. also Hor. Ep. I 19, 7 sq. Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma Prosiluit dicenda; Seren. Samon. c. 37, v. 713 sq. Ennius ipse pater, dum pocula siccat iniqua, Hoc vitio tales fertur meruisse dolores), sepultusquo in Scipionis monumento (see n. 3), via Appia intra primum ab urbe miliarium. Quidam ossa eius Rudiam ex Ianiculo translata adfirmant (it may be, because a monument was there placed to him). His epitaph ap. Cic. Tusc. I 15, 34: aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam. Hic vestrum panxit maxima facta patrum etc., comp. ib. 117. Cato mai. 73.

90. His greatest renown Ennius gained as an epic poet, by his Annales, in which the traditional Roman history, from Aeneas' arrival in Italy down to the poet's own time, was related in chronological order. The work was meant to be a pendant to the Homeric poems, and was also considered as such by the Romans — though there can be no doubt that its artistic value was but very small. It was important on account of the introduction of the epic line of the Greeks into Roman literature, besides many other details in which the Homeric style was imitated.

1. The best collection of the fragments (above 600 lines and parts of lines) is by J. Vahlen, Ennianae poes. reliquiae (Lips. 1854), p. 3—88.

Comp. ibid. p. XVIII—LXXX. A criticism of Ennius' character as a poet by Mommsen H. R. I² p. 899—901.

2. Diomed. III p. 480 P. = 384, 3 ff. K. (after Reifferscheid's emendations, Jahn's Jahrb. 79, p. 157 sq.): epos latinum primus digne scripsit Ennius, qui res Romanorum decem et octo complexus est libris, qui vel annales (in)scribuntur, quod singulorum fere annorum actus contineant, sicut publici annales quos pontifices scribaeque conficiunt, vel Romais (according to Reifferscheid a title invented in the Augustan time), quod Romanorum res gestas declarant.

3. The first book (fragmenta emend., dispos., illustr. H. Ilberg, Bonn 1852. Vahlen p. XX—XXXIX): Introduction, earliest traditions, foundation of Rome, the deification of Romulus. The second book (Vahlen p. XXXIX sq.): Numa to Ancus Martius. The third (Vahlen p. XL—XLIII): the three last kings. The fourth (ib. XLIII—XLV): the beginning of the republic until the Gallic conflagration. The fifth (ib. XLV—XLVII): perhaps the wars with the Samnites. The sixth (p. XLVII—LV): Pyrrhus. The seventh (librorum VII—IX s. de bellis punicis fragmenta emend., disp., illustr. Th. Hug, Bonn 1852. Vahlen p. LV—LXI): the first Punic war, though only in a brief summary, the subject having already been treated by Naevius, who was spoken of in a somewhat contemptuous manner; see Cic. Brut. 19, 75. The eighth and ninth (Vahlen p. LXI—LXVIII): the war with Hannibal. The tenth and eleventh (ib. p. LXVIII—LXXI): the Macedonian war. The twelfth (ib. p. LXXI sq.): ? The thirteenth and fourteenth (p. LXXII—LXXIV): the war with Antiochus. The fifteenth (p. LXXIV sq.): Fulvius Nobilior in Aetolia. The death of Africanus the Elder (a. 567). Thus the conclusion of the work came to the year 570. — Plin. N. H. VII 29, 101 (speaking of fortitudo becoming the subject of poetica fabulositas): Q. Ennius T. (Liv. XXXIX 56, XL 1 has L.) Caecilium Dentrem fratremque (M., see Liv. XLII 6) eius praecipue miratus propter eos sextum decumum adiecit annalem. The work received then a new preface, and further continuations in books XVII and XVIII (Vahlen p. LXXV—LXXX), in which the events from 571 until 580 were treated and finally an account was given of the poet himself; see Gell. XVII 21, 43: consules Q. Valerius et C. Manilius, quibus natum esse Q. Ennium poetam M. Varro in primo de poetis libro scripsit eumque cum septimum et sexagesimum annum haberet (i. e. a. 582) duodevigesimum (so Merula, F. Ritter and Vahlen: XIIX instead of XII) annalem scripsisse idque ipsum Ennium in eodem libro dicere.

4. Q. Vargunteius annales Ennii, quos certis diebus in magna frequentia pronuntiabat, Suet. gramm. 2. Comp. ib. 8: M. Pompilius Andronicus .. adeo inops atque egens ut coactus sit praecipuum illud opusculum suum, Annalium Ennii elenchorum XVI milibus nummum cuidam vendere. Cic. opt. gen. or. 1, 2: licet dicere Ennium summum epicum poetam, si cui ita videtur. Martial. V 10, 7 sq.: Ennius est lectus salvo tibi, Roma, Marone, Et sua riserunt saecula Maeoniden. Vitruv. IX praef. 16: qui litterarum iucunditatibus instinctas habent

mentes non possunt non in suis pectoribus dedicatum habere sicut deorum sic Ennii poetae simulacrum. Quintil. X 1, 88: Ennium sicut sacros vetustate lucos adoremus, in quibus grandia et antiqua robora iam non tantam habent speciem quantam religionem. Comp. II 17, 24: dicet notum illud (words of Ennius): dum clavom rectum teneam; comp. IX 4, 115. Vulcat. Gall. Avid. Cass. 5, 7: scis versum a bono poeta dictum et omnibus frequentatum: Moribus antiquis etc. Gell. XVIII 5, 2 (Antonio) Iuliano nuntiatur anagnosten quendam, non indoctum hominem, voce admodum scita et canora Enni Annales legere ad populum in theatro. ib. 3: Ennianistam .. se ille appellari volebat. 4: quem cum iam inter ingentes clamores legentum invenissemus etc. 7: cumque aliquot eorum qui aderant 'quadrupes equus' apud suum quisque grammaticum legisse se dicerent etc. Spart. Hadr. 16, 6: Ciceroni Catonem, Vergilio Ennium, Salustio Coelium praetulit. Macrob. Sat. VI.9, 9: quia saeculum nostrum ab Ennio et omni bibliotheca vetere descivit, multa ignoramus quae non laterent si veterum lectio nobis esset familiaris.

91. Tragedies held the place of second importance amongst Ennius' productions. He seems to have translated Euripides in preference to other poets, perhaps attracted by his free thinking and rhetorical manner. He also wrote a. praetexta, entitled Ambracia, and comedies, though he did not distinguish himself in this department.

1. We possess fragments of Achilles and (? comp. Welcker, trag. p. 1374. Klussmann in Jahn's Jahrb. Suppl. XI p. 325—328) Achilles Aristarchi, Aiax, Alcumaeo, Alexander, Andromacha, Aechmalotis, Andromeda, Athamas (? Welcker l. l.), Cresphontes, Erechtheus, Eumenides, Hectoris lustra, Hecuba (F. Osann, Anal. crit. Berlin 1816 p. 126—140), Iphigenia, Medea exsul (comp. H. Planck, Q. Ennii Medea, commentario perpet. illustr. etc. Gött. 1807. 4. F. Osann, l. l. p. 79—125), Medea Atheniensis, Melanippa, Nemea, Phoenix, Telamo, Telephus, Thyestes. The fragments in Ribbeck, Trag. lat. p. 13—62 (comp. p. 248—278), and Vahlen Enn. p. 91—150. Welcker, Greek trag. p. 1373—1380. Of these, Andromeda Hecuba Iphigenia, Medea exsul, Melanippa Telephus Alexander Andromacha are certain to be translations from Euripides, and so are in all probability Alcumaeo, Cresphontes, Erechtheus, Medea Ath., Phoenix. Only the Eumenides was translated from Aeschylus, Aiax probably from Sophocles, and only one Achilles from Aristarchus. A comparison with the original plays shows that Ennius' were free translations, the plot being in the Iphigenia completed from Sophocles. See Cic. fin. I 2, 4: cum ... fabellas latinas ad verbum e graecis expressas non inviti legant. quis enim tam inimicus paene nomini romano est qui Ennii Medeam aut Antiopam Pacuvii spernat aut reiciat quod se isdem Euripidis fabulis delectari dicat? de opt. gen. 6, 18: eidem .. Andromacham aut Antiopam aut Epigonos latinas

recipiunt; quod igitur est eorum in orationibus e graeco conversis fastidium, nullum cum sit in versibus? Gell. XI 4: Euripidis versus sunt in Hecuba . . . Hos versus Q. Ennius, cum eam tragoediam verteret, non sane incommode aemulatus est. Cic. Brut. 20, 78 proves that Ennius remained faithful to this occupation till his end.

2. Ambracia was most likely a praetexta treating of the capture of that town by his patron M. Fulvius Nobilior, a. 565. Ribbeck, com. lat. p. IX sq., comp. Vahlen, Ennius p. 153. Another praetexta of Ennius (Sabinae: the rape of the Sabine women) is conjectured by Vahlen (Rh. Mus. XVI p. 590, comp. Enn. p. LXXXVIII) from Jul. Victor. p. 402, 30 Halm: ut (in) Sabinis Ennius dixit.

3. Ennius does not seem to have been very successful in the easy comic style. Of two comedies, Cupuncula and Pancratiastes, we have slight traces; see Ribb. com. p. 4. Vahlen, Enn. p. LXXXI and p. 153 sq. Volcatius Sedigitus mentioned his name among the comic poets only antiquitatis causa.

92. Ennius further published Saturae, i. e. a collection of miscellaneous poems in various metres. Parts of this work may be recognised in the Scipio, as well as perhaps in the Sota, Protrepticus, Heduphagetica, Epicharmus, Euhemerus and in the epigrams.

1. On Ennius' saturae see Vahlen, Ennius p. LXXXI—XC; the fragments ib. p. 154 sqq. They were in four books according to Porphyr. on Hor. Sat. I 10, 47; but Donatus on Ter. Phorm. II 2, 25 quotes from a sixth. The metres were trochaic, iambic, Sotadean and hexametrical lines; it is neither probable nor attested that Ennius ever wrote Saturnians. Their subjects were didactic, and there were also fables. — C. Petermann, on Ennius' satirae. Hirschberg 1851 sq. 4. See above 24, 1.

2. The Scipio was probably the 3rd book of the saturae: Vahlen, p. LXXXVI. See on it F. Ritter, Ztschrf. f. AW. 1840 p. 388—395. It was written before the Annals, perhaps 554, after Scipio's victorious return from Africa (a. 553); there is no sufficient reason for putting it to a later date; Vahlen p. LXXXVII. Here too we have varying metres. The style was grave and elevated, so as to correspond with the subject. The fragments (some not quite certain, esp. II) in Vahlen Enn. p. 155—157.

3. Sota = Sotades (*Σωτάδης*), from whom the Sotadean metre has received its name. In Sota Ennii, Varro L. L. V 62; in Asota, Fest. p. 316 M. Vahlen Enn. p. 164 sq. XC sq.

4. Praecepta s. Protrepticus, a bilingual title, Vahlen p. 165 and XCI.

5. Heduphagetica, on gastronomical matters, after the Alexandrine poet Archestratus, Vahlen p. 166 and XCI sq. Rh. Mus. XVI p. 581 note.

6. Epicharmus, a kind of didactic poem on subjects of natural philosophy, seems to have received its name from the person into whose mouth was put the Pythagorean philosophy propounded in the work. It was in trochaic tetrameters. Vahlen p. 167 sq. and XCIII sq.

7. Euhemerus, sive Sacra historia, a Latin version of the ἱερὰ ἀναγραφή of Euhemerus (a. 450 V. C.), in which this mad and blasphemous system of mythical explanation was also applied to the gods of Italy. Cic. N. D. I 41, 119: Euhemerus,.. quem noster et interpretatus et secutus est praeter ceteros Ennius. Augustin Civ. D. VII 26 (27): totam de hoc Euhemerus pandit historiam quam Ennius in latinum vertit eloquium. In the quotations of Lactantius (from a prose version) the original trochaic rhythm is often heard. — Krahner, Outlines of a history of the decay etc. p. 37 sqq. Gerlach, Histor. Studies p. 154 sqq. Mommsen, H. R. I² p. 843. Vahlen p. XCIII sq. and p. 169 sqq. B. ten Brink, Varronis locus de urbe Roma. Accedunt Q. Ennii apologus Aesopicus et reliquiae Euhemeri versibus quadratis, Utrecht 1855.

8. The few epigrams (in elegiacs), e. g. Ennius' epitaph, in Vahlen Enn. p. 162 sq. comp. p. XC.

93. Ennius possessed a decided impulse towards artistic perfection. He seems, indeed, to have been a rapid writer, and his poems frequently violate the laws of beauty and good taste; but in the new path chosen by him he had also very great difficulties to overcome, and by his position he was prevented from evenly developing his rich talents. This disproportion between his external position and internal abilities increased also his self-consciousness. In his own time he was a missionary of culture and free thought, and he turned the Roman language and style into the paths in which it continued for centuries afterwards.

1. The Augustan and Imperial poets ungratefully and unjustly dwell on Ennius' imperfect formal polish. Hor. Ep. II 1, 50—52. 3, 259—262. Prop. IV 1, 61. Ovid. Am. I 15, 19. Val. Max. VIII 14, 1. Sen. Ep. 58, 5, comp. Dial. V 37, 5. Fragm. 110—114. Martial. XI 90. Macrob. I 4, 17. A juster appreciation in Ovid Trist. II 423 sq.: suo Martem cecinit gravis Ennius ore, Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis. Comp. Quintil. I. O. I 8, 8. X 1, 40. Also Sen. fr. 114 H.: quidam sunt tam magni sensus Q. Ennii ut, licet scripti sint inter hircosos, possint tamen inter unguentatos placere. Macrob. Sat. VI 3, 9: nemo ex hoc viles putet veteres poetas quod versus eorum scabri nobis videntur. ille enim stilus Enniani saeculi auribus solus placebat etc. Quintil. X 1, 88. Fronto p. 171 Rom. = 114, 2 Naber: multiformis. Cicero, somewhat exaggerating, de or. I 45, 198 and de prov. cons. 9, 21: summus poeta. Tusc. III 19, 45 sq.: egregius poeta .. praeclarum carmen. But Orat. 11, 36: multa apud Ennium neglegentius. pro Mur. 14, 30:

ingeniosus poeta et auctor valde bonus. Affected admiration also in Vitruvius: see above 90, 4. — Comp. Lucr. I 118 sq. Mommsen, H. R. I² p. 892—896.

2. Artificial treatment of the language and metre, sometimes even faults of taste, occur e. g. Ann. 113. 586. 452. Trag. 337. 448. Sat. 34 sq. Comp. L. Müller in Jahn's Jahrb. 95 p. 504 sq. Acrostichon Q. Ennius fecit, Cic. de divin. II 54, 111.

3. His self-consciousness: comp. his epitaph, his criticism on Naevius (Cic. Brut. 19, 76). Ann. 3 sq. 15 Sat. 6 sq. But see also Ann. 551.

4. His rationalism (besides Euhemerus) appears esp. from Trag. 353—359 V.: égo deum genus ésse semper díxi et dicam caélitum, Séd eos non curáre opinor quíd agat humanúm genus; Nám si curent, béne bonis sit, mále malis, quod núnc abest — Séd superstitiósi vates ínpudentesque árioli Aút inertes aút insani aut quíbus egestas ímperat, Quí sibi semitám non sapiunt, álteri monstránt viam; Quíbus divitias póllicentur, áb eis drachumam ipsí petunt.

5. For his merits concerning the formation of the language, see above 81 p. 109 sq. Ungermann, Q. Ennius poeta versu hexametro in litteras latinas inducto quatenus meritus sit, Coblence 1866. 4. — Festus p. 293 M.: nulla geminabatur littera in scribendo. quam consuetudinem Ennius mutavisse fertur, utpote Graecus graeco more usus, quod illi aeque scribentes ac legentes duplicabant mutas, semi [vocales et liquidas]. Isidor. Et. I 22: vulgares notas Ennius primus mille et centum invenit.

6. Older (and antiquated) collections of the fragments by H. Columna (Naples 1590. 4.) = Fr. Hessel, Amsterd. 1707. 4.; of the Annals by P. Merula (Leyden 1595. 4.) and E. S(pangenberg), Lips. 1825. M. Hoch, de Ennianorum Ann. fragm. a P. Merula auctis, Bonn 1839. Jos. Lawicki, de fraude P. Merulae Ennianorum annalium editoris, Bonn 1852. Th. Bergk, Quaestiones Ennianae, Marburg 1844. XVII pp. 4.; Specimen novum, Halle 1860. 11 pp. 4.; Critical studies on Enn., in Jahn's (Fleck's) Jahrb. 83 p. 316—334. 495—509. 617—638. de Ennianis primus mille et centum invenit.

7. Ennianae poesis reliquiae. Rec. Io. Vahlen. Lips. 1854. XCIV and 238 pp. 8. Comp. Schneidewin, Götti. Gel. Anz. 1855 p. 655—671. O. Ribbeck, Rh. Mus. X p. 265—292. Vahlen, Rh. M. XIV p. 552—569. XVI p. 571—585.

94. M. Pacuvius, the son of Ennius' sister, was born c. 534 V. C. at Brundisium, and, drawn by his uncle to Rome, where he carried on both the profession of a painter and the writing of plays, especially of tragedies. After having exhibited plays there as late as 614, he returned to the South of Italy and died at Tarentum c. 622. Of his writings we know only the titles of 12 tragedies and one praetexta (Paulus). His tragedies show a pre-

ference for Sophocles combined with a certain lowering of the work to the level of an ordinary drama, and all fragments are somewhat common-place in tone, style and versification.

1. Cic. Brut. 64, 229: Attius isdem aedilibus ait se et Pacuvium docuisse fabulam, cum ille octoginta, ipse triginta annos natus esset. Attius was born 584. Jerome ad Euseb. chr. ol. 156, 3 = 602 V. C. = 152 a. Chr. n.: Pacuvius Brundisinus tragoediarum scriptor clarus habetur, Ennii poetae ex filia (erroneously instead of his sister, see Pliny) nepos, vixitque Romae quoad picturam exercuit ac fabulas venditavit. Deinde Tarentum transgressus prope nonagenarius diem obiit. Plin. N. H. XXXV 7: proxime celebrata est in foro boario, aede Herculis, Pacuvii poetae pictura. Ennii sorore genitus hic fuit, clarioremque eam artem Romae fecit gloria scenae. Gell. XIII 2, 2: cum Pacuvius grandi iam aetate et morbo corporis diutino adfectus Tarentum ex urbe Roma concessisset etc. and I 24, 4: epigramma Pacuvii verecundissimum et purissimum dignumque eius elegantissima gravitate: . . . Hic sunt poetae Pacuvi Marci sita Ossa etc.

2. Tragedies: Antiopa, Armorum iudicium, Atalanta, Chryses, Dulorestes, Hermiona, Iliona, Medus, Niptra, Pentheus, Periboea, Teucer. The fragments are collected in Ribbeck's Trag. p. 62—114, comp. p. 278—298 and Welcker, Trag. p. 1380—1384. W. Teuffel, progr. of Tübingen 1858 p. 7—11. The tragedy of Paulus (Ribb. p. 236, comp. p. 349) probably treated of Aemilius Paulus Macedonicus: O. Jahn, Trans. of the Saxon society of Letters 1856, p. 301.

3. Diomedes' testimony, III p. 483 P. = 485, 33 K. is very uncertain: satira . . carmen . . quale scripserunt Pacuvius et Ennius.

4. Gell. VI (VII) 14, 6: exempla in latina lingua M. Varro esse dicit ubertatis Pacuvium, gracilitatis Lucilium, mediocritatis Terentium. Fronto, however, p. 114, 1 (Naber) calls him mediocris. Cic. Brut. 74, 258: illorum (Laelius and Africanus minor) aequales Caecilium et Pacuvium male locutos videmus; comp. ad Att. VII 3, 10. Orat. 46, 155. Lucil. ap. Non. p. 30, 27: tristis contorto aliquo ex Pacuviano exordio. Hor. Ep. II 1, 55 sq. Quintil. X 1, 97. Pers. Sat. I 77 sp. Martial XI 91. Tac. dial. 20. A review of these judgments by W. Teuffel, Tüb. progr. 1858 p. 11—14.

5. H. Stieglitz, de Pacuvii Duloreste, Lips. 1826. 130 pp. 8. Th. Ladewig, Pacuvius, in Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 1042—1044. J. Wennemer, de Pacuvio, inprimis de eius Antiopae, Dulorestis Ilionaeque fragmentis; Münster 1853. 50 pp. 8. Mommsen, H. R. II² p. 432 sq. W. Teuffel, Caecilius, Statius, Pacuvius etc. Tübingen 1858, 4. p. 5—14.

95. Statius Caecilius, a contemporary of Pacuvius of almost the same age, belonged by his birth to the Celtic tribe of the Insubrians, and came to Rome probably as a prisoner of war c. 554—560. After his manumission he associated himself

especially with Ennius whom he did not survive very long, without however reaching the same old age as Ennius. Thus standing midway between Plautus and Terence, Caecilius seems in his comedies (which were also adaptations from New Attic originals) to have at first adhered more to the manner of Plautus, and later on, in accordance with the Greek fashion of the period, to have more conformed to rules, though he always retained greater originality than Terence. His fragments show the usual manner of the palliatae, but not so many archaic forms as Plautus.

1. Jerome on Euseb. Chr. Ol. 150, 2 = 575 = 170 a. Chr.: Statius Caecilius comoediarum scriptor clarus habetur, natione Insuber Gallus et Ennii primum contubernalis. Quidam Mediolanensem ferunt. Mortuus est anno post mortem Ennii III (the number added by Ritschl, Sueton. ed. Reifferscheid, p. 497, in order to carry Caecilius' life down to the performance of Terence's Andria) et iuxta eum in Ianiculo (so Ritschl l. l. instead of iuxta Ianiculum) sepultus. Comp. C. F. Hermann, de script. ill. p. 3 sq. Gell. IV 20, 13: Caecilius ille comoediarum poeta inclutus servus fuit et propterea nomen habuit Statius. Sed postea versum est quasi in cognomentum appellatusque est Caecilius Statius. Merely Caecilius he is called in Cic. de or. II 10, 40. Brut. 74, 258. de opt. gen. 1, 2. ad Att. VII 3, 10; Statius alone never, not even de or. II 64, 257. — If Caecilius died a. 588, he may have been born c. 535, as he is nowhere numbered among the longaevi, and was therefore of a fit age for military service in 554—560.

2. At first he was not successful in his plays, see prol. II 6 sqq. of Ter.'s Hecyra. Later on, he was employed as an authority to pass judgment on plays offered for exhibition, Suet. vit. Ter. 2. Ritschl, Par. p. 329 note.

3. Of the 39 or 40 titles of comedies known to us (see Caecilii Statii . . deperd. fabb. fragm. ed. L. Spengel, Munich 1829. 62 pp. 4. and Ribbeck com. p. 29—69) 16 agree with titles of Menander (Andria, Androgynos, Chalcia, Dardanus, Ephesius, Hymnis, Hypobolimaeus, Rastraria, Imbrii, Karine, Nauclerus, Plocium, Polumeni, Progamos, Synaristosae, Synephebi, Titthe), two (Chrysion and Epicleros?) with titles of Epiphanes, one (Epistathmos) with Posidippus, and one (Epistula?) with Alexis. The titles themselves are divided into three classes (Ritschl, Par. p. 144 sq.): 1) merely Latin ones, in the manner of Plautus; 2) double titles, in Latin and in Greek; 3) merely in Greek, in the manner of Terence and Turpilius. The last by far preponderate in number. Hence it may be inferred that Caecilius wrote "at first in pursuance of the manner of Plautus, but he seems gradually to have emancipated himself, and by closer adherence to the Greek style finally to have succeeded in acquainting the Romans with a style quite

foreign to them, so that they became capable of understanding and receiving a genuine work of Greek art." (Ritschl, l. l. p. 145 note.)

4. Varro ap. Non. v. poscere: in argumentis Caecilius poscit palmam; ap. Charis. II p. 215 P. = 241, 28 sq. K.: *παθη* Trabea, Atilius, Caecilius facile moverunt. Comp. Hor. Ep. II 1, 59 and other notices in W. Teuffel's progr. of 1858, p. 3, note 16—20. Being an Insubrian by birth and having come to Rome only late, Caecilius could not be considered as a competent authority for good Latin: Cic. ad Att. VII 3, 10.

5. In general see Mommsen I² p. 883 and W. Teuffel, Caecilius Statius etc. Tübingen 1858. 4. p. 1—5.

96. In the time of Caecilius, Trabea was another poet of palliatae, and perhaps also Atilius who seems to have resembled him; so was the author of the Boeotia, Aquilius, and Licinius Imbrex. Luscius Lavinius was an older contemporary and rival of Terence.

1. Varro ap. Charis. II p. 215: *παθη* Trabea, Atilius, Caecilius facile moverunt. Comp. Ritschl Par. p. 194 sq. who places the time of the two former before that of Caecilius, who came to Rome when a full-grown man. Trabea's nomen gentile is unknown, the praenomen Q. without any authority. Two fragments (in Cic.'s Tusc.) of lively tone and polished language are found in Ribb. com. p. 26.

2. The scanty fragments of Atilius (p. 27 Ribb.), as a poet of palliatae designated by the title of Misogynos, are more archaic. As Cic. (ad Att. XIV 20, 3) calls him poeta durissimus and Porcius Licinus ap. Cic. fin. I 2, 5 calls Atilius who translated Sophocles' Electra a ferreus scriptor, the two may be presumed to be identical. It is less probable that he is identical with the actor L. Hatilius of Praeneste who performed in the plays of Terence, probably at the beginning of the 7th century: Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XXI p. 72, n. 13.

3. The Boeotia (shown by its title to be a palliata) which was considered to be by Aquilius even before Varro's time, was yet attributed by the latter to Plautus on account of its Plautine style (Gell. III 3, 3 sq.), though L. Attius had emphatically protested against this supposition (ib. 9.). The historical allusions point to a. V. C. 580—600. Ritschl, Par. p. 82 sqq. 123 sqq. 208. Ribbeck, com. p. 27—29.

4. Licinius Imbrex, vetus comoediarum scriptor, in fabula quae Neaera (in)scripta est, Gell. XIII 23, 16. Comp. Paul. Diac. p. 109 M.: Imbrex nomen cuiusdam comici. The title Neaera shows that he wrote palliatae. Ribb. com. p. 29.

5. Luscius Lavinius (Lanuvinus), the (malevolus) vetus poeta against whom all the Terentian prologues are directed, except the one to the Hecyra. He translated several plays of the New Attic Comedy, e. g. Menander's *Φάσμα* (Ter. Eun. prol. 9) and a *Θησαυρός* (ib. 10), so faith-

fully as to preserve even details which were sure to displease a Roman audience, and blamed Terence's deviations from his Greek originals and his additions from other Greek plays as faults. Ter. Eun. prol. 10 sqq. Comp. Andr. prol. 15 sqq. Haut. 16 sqq. Ad. 1 sqq. Grauert, Analekten p. 116 sq. Ladewig, on the canon of Volc. Sed. p. 12—17. Ribbeck, com. p. 71 sq.

6. For Plautius see above § 84, 5.

97. P. Terentius (Afer) was a native of Carthage, but at an early age came to Rome, where he was the slave of a senator Terentius (Lucanus), by whom he was educated like a free man, and soon manumitted. Perhaps on account of his African birth, he came into intimate relations with Africanus the younger, a fact which gave rise to the rumour that the latter was the real author of his plays. After having exhibited six plays, Terence went to Greece in order to study there. On returning he died a. 595 = 159, in the early age of 26, leaving a daughter.

1. Our principal source is the extract from Suetonius' work de poetis preserved by Donatus, in the introduction to his commentary on Terence, mostly a compilation of the frequently disagreeing reports of the grammarians. Comp. N. Fritsch, Suetonii vita Ter. emend. et illustr. Bonn 1852. K. L. Roth, Rh. Mus. XII p. 174—188. H. Dörgens, Philol. XI p. 787 sq., and espec. Ritschl's edition in Reifferscheid's Sueton. reliqq. (Lips. 1860) p. 26—35 and p. 479—538. See also Th. Bergk, Philol. XVI p. 627—636.

2. Other biographies and notices, e. g. in Jerome's translation of Eusebius' chronicles (ad Ol. 155, 3), the vita edited by G. v. Murr (Nuremberg 1786 sqq.) from a Nuremberg ms., and the one published by A. Mai (Mediol. 1815) from a Milan ms. (hence called vita Ambrosiana), are derived from the same source, partly with arbitrary additions. Comp. Ritschl l. l. p. 534 sqq. Only the very short "additamentum" of Donatus possesses an independent value.

3. Terence probably came to Rome through a slave-dealer who either bought or caught him in Africa. He cannot have been a prisoner of war, as he was born after the end of the second Punic war (553) and died before the commencement of the 3rd; see Fenestella in Suetonius. Bergk l. l. p. 628 says "it is by no means improbable that Terence was taken prisoner at an inroad made by the Numidians into the Carthaginian territory and thus came into the house of a Roman senator either in the way of trade or as a present from Masinissa or one of his political agents."

4. The praenomen Publius, he may have received either from his patron or from another protector, perhaps Africanus the younger.

Comp. Cic. ad fam. XIII 35, 1. Att. IV 15, 1. Th. Mommsen, Rh. Mus. IX p. 452.

5. Cum multis nobilibus familiariter vixit, sed maxime cum Scipione Africano et C. Laelio. quibus etiam corporis gratia conciliatus existimatur .. non obscura fama est adiutum Terentium in scriptis a Laelio et Scipione, eamque ipse auxit numquam nisi leviter (cf. prol. to Hautont. and Ad.) refutare conatus. (Suet. l. l.) The latter he may have done because the rumour was offensive to neither party. Comments on it in Suet. l. l. Comp. Cic. ad Att. VII 3, 10: Terentium, cuius fabellae propter elegantiam sermonis putabantur a C. Laelio scribi. Quintil. I. O. X 1, 99: licet Terentii scripta ad Scipionem Africanum referantur. Vagellius in Actione ap. Don. It is possible that, before publishing, Terence used to read his compositions in the circle of his friends and avail himself of their observations and suggestions. We may, at all events, consider this rumour as a sufficient warrant for the genuine Roman character of Terence's style and language.

6. Post editas comoedias nondum quintum atque vicesimum (the number XXXVI is only in bad mss.) egressus (Ritschl: ingressus) annum, causa vitandae opinionis qua videbatur aliena pro suis edere seu (studio added by Ritschl) percipiendi Graecorum instituta moresque, quos non perinde exprimeret in scriptis, egressus (G. Becker: in Graeciam profectus) est neque amplius rediit .. Q. Cosconius redeuntem e Graecia perisse in mari dicit cum fabulis (CVIII is added in the mss., which is however only a repetition and corruption of CVM) conversis a Menandro, ceteri mortuum esse in Arcadia (Ritschl omits Stymphali) sive Leucadiae tradunt (Fleckeisen, Crit. Miscellanea, Dresden 1864, p. 59—61: perisse in mari in sinu Leucadiae dicit), Cn. Cornelio Dolabella M. Fulvio Nobiliore coss. (a. 595), morbo implicatum ex dolore ac taedio amissarum sarcinarum, quas nave praemiserat, ac simul fabularum quas novas fecerat. Sueton. l. l. Comp. Lucan. V 651 sq.: oraeque malignos Ambraciae portus, on which the Schol. observes: malignos dixit, sive quia saxosi sunt sive quia Terentius illic dicitur periisse. Auson. epist. 18, 16: Arcadiae medio qui iacet in gremio.

7. As the Hecyra and Adelphoe were acted a. 594 and Terence died a. 595, he cannot have been away from Rome much longer than a year. If he died 26 years old, he was born 569, i. e. about the same time as Africanus minor. Fenestella's theory (advanced in defence of Terence) that he was older than Scipio and Laelius, seems to be unsupported; Ritschl p. 513 sq.

8. Fuisse dicitur mediocri statura, gracili corpore, colore fusco (Suet. l. l. comp. Ps.-Verg. Mor. 32 sq.: Afra genus, tota patriam testante figura, torta comam labroque tumens et fusca colore). His portrait on contorniates at Gotha, and in a Vatican ms. of his works from the 9th saec.; a bust of Ter. with a comic mask over the right arm has been in the Capitoline museum since 1839. Visconti, Iconogr. rom. I p. 317 sqq. O. Müller's Archeology by Welcker 421, 3.

9. Reliquit filiam, quae post equiti rom. nupsit, item hortulos XX iugerum in via Appia ad Martis (comp. Pauly's Encyclop. I 2 p. 158 note). Suetonius.

98. All the six comedies written and exhibited at Rome by Terence are extant in numerous mss, divided into two classes, the Bembine and those representing the text of Calliopius. His plays were also commented on in the Imperial period; we possess only the commentaries of Donatus and of Eugraphius. There are also didascaliae to the plays, though in a very difficult text, and metrical arguments.

1. Scripsit comoedias sex, ex quibus primam Andriam etc. Suet. l. l. cf. Auson. epist. 18, 15 of the number six: protulit in scenam quot dramata fabellarum etc.

2. On the mss. of Terence see Ritschl, de emendatione fabularum Terentianarum, before the Breslau Index 1838. According to him, the Bembine is by far the oldest and best ms.; the Victorianus and Decurtatus (both used by Faërnus and recently again discovered by Umpfenbach) as well as the Basilicanus, Vaticanus, Ambrosianus bear the subscription of Calliopius. See O. Jahn, on subscriptions, in the Trans. of the Saxon Society of Letters 1851 p. 362—364. On the two oldest mss. at Paris see Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VIII p. 289—292. Geppert, contributions to a history of Terentian criticism, Jahn's Jahrb. Suppl. XVIII p. 28—87.

3. Commentators: Probus, Asper, Aelius Donatus, Euanthius, Helenius Acro; Aruntius Celsus is doubtful: see Suringar, hist. crit. schol. lat. I p. 77 sqq. Ritschl Par. p. 361 sqq. Aelius Donatus' commentary on Terence (middle of the 4th century of the Christian era), valuable also on account of his quotations from the Greek originals, was printed the first time (ed. princeps) at Rome 1472, and repeated in most of the old editions, also in Zeune's edition. L. Schopen, de Terentio et Donato eius interprete, Bonn 1821, and Specimen emend. in Ael. Donati comm. Ter., Bonn 1826. 4. A. Richter, de Donati comm. Ter., Bonn 1854. Eugraphius' commentary (end of the 10th century after Christ) possesses no independent value.

4. The now current text of the didascaliae is due to the Emendationes of Ant. Goveanus (Venice 1567). Ritschl, Par. p. 325, note. In it various readings both of the Bemb. and of the Calliopian text are mixed up. Both are again founded on a more original and complete collection of notices, which seem to have been put together from stage-copies by grammarians of the 7th century V. C. The Bemb. ms. gives an unsatisfactory and confused selection which is, however, not disfigured by systematic revision or arbitrary changes; the Calliopian text is systematic in as far as it reports only one (the first) performance, but partly arbitrary. Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XXI p. 87 sqq. See

in general Ritschl, Par. p. 263 sqq. J. A. Becker in the Mayence progr. of 1852. 4. Geppert in Jahn's Jahrb. Suppl. XVIII p. 550—582. W. Wilmanns, de didascaliis Terentianis, Berlin 1864. 66 pp. 8. Alfr. Kohl, didascaliae Terentianae explicatae, Halle 1865. 65 pp. 8. C. Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XX p. 570—598. XXI p. 64—92.

5. The list in § 99 is in accordance with the traditional order, which agrees with the Bemb, in which it seems to be intended as the order of composition. The Bemb. ms. alone makes regular mention of the order, denoting it by facta I (prima or primo loco), II etc. (Ritschl Par. p. 263 and p. 264 note), while the other mss. mention it only in two places, though so as to agree with the Bemb. In Donatus Andria is also I, Phorm. IV, Hec. V; but Eun. is with him III and Ad. II. The Hecyra is marked inconsistently, as it ought to be II according to the time of composition, but VI according to that of its final exhibition; see Ritschl in Reifferscheid's Suetonius p. 501. During Terence's life-time the didascaliae prove the following performances to have taken place —

a. 588. Andria
589. Hecyra I
591. Hauton timorumenos
593. Eunuchus (lud. meg. in April)
Phormio (lud. rom. in September)
594. Hecyra II and Adelphoe } at the funeral games of Aemilius Paulus
Hecyra III (complete performance, ludis romanis).

Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XXI p. 84—87. On the possibility of an earlier performance of the Adelphoe see below § 99, 6.

6. The brief arguments in iambics (periochae) of the single pieces have in the Bemb. always the heading — C. Sulpici Apollinaris periocha.

7. A. L. R. Liebig, de prologis Terentianis et Plautinis, Görlitz 1859. 50 pp. 4. C. Dziatzko, de prologis Plaut. et Ter. quaestiones selectae, Bonn 1863. 38 pp. 8.; see also W. Wagner in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 91 p. 279—293.

99. These six plays are as follows:

1) Andria, exhibited a. 588 on the Megalensian games, an adaptation of Menander's Andria with additions from the same poet's *Περινθία*. The last scene exists in two texts.

In the Bemb. the didasc., together with the beginning of the play, is lost, but Donatus reports about the first and second performance, the latter between 611—620 by Q. Minucius and Valerius, Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XXI. 64 sq. See Sueton. vit. Ter.: primam Andriam cum aedilibus daret, iussus ante Caecilio recitare ad cenantem cum venisset, dicitur initium quidem fabulae, quod erat contemptiore vestitu, subsellio iuxta lectulum residens legisse, post paucos vero versus invitatus

ut accumberet cenasse una, dein cetera percucurrisse non sine magna Caecilii admiratione.

C. Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XX p. 579 sq. XXI p. 64 sq. maintains that the prologue was intended for the first performance, in opposition to W. Wagner, in the lib. misc. Soc. Bonn. 1864 p. 72—82.

On its relation to the Greek originals see Grauert, Analekten p. 173—197. C. Fr. Hermann, Ter. Andr. quam fideliter ad Menandrum expressa sit, Marburg 1838. W. Ihne, Quaest. p. 5—15. Th. Benfey's pref. to his translation. W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. VIII p. 41 sq.

For the last scene see Döderlein, lect. var. trias, fin. E. Grauert, Analekten p. 197—204. Ritschl, Par. p. 583—606. According to Ritschl both texts are ancient, but by different authors; the shorter seems to be older and by Terence himself, the longer intended for a performance not long after Terence's death.

Editions: with copious notes by Perlet, Ronneburg 1805; cum notis ed. Fikenscher, Lips. 1809; ex rec. Fr. Ritteri, Berl. 1833; with critical and exegetical notes by R. Klotz, Leipzig 1865. XII and 220 pp. 8.; rec. et illustr. L. Quicherat, Paris 1866. 69 pp. 15.

Roos, on the character of Sosia in the Andria, in his Essays on the Classics, Giessen 1790, p. 39—93. Drakenborch, dictata ad Ter. com., in Grauert's Anal. p. 1—56. A. B. Wolff in Ter. A., Guben 1811. J. Wollenberg, the text of the Andria collated with a ms. in the library at Tours, in Mützell's Ztschfr. XIV p. 711—718. Vogel, Ter. Andr. in graecum conversa, p. I. Treptow 1863. 4.

2) Eunuchus, a clever contamination from Menander's *Εὐνοῦχος* and some parts of his *Κόλαξ*. The varied and lively plot obtained even in the poet's life-time a decided success for the play.

On its relation to the originals see Grauert, Anal. p. 147—173. W. Ihne, Quaest. p. 15—25. W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. XIII p. 42—45. According to Pers. Sat. V 161 sqq. Thais was in the *Εὐνοῦχος* called Chrysis, Phaedria Chaerestratus, Parmeno-Davus, and Gnatho in the *Κόλαξ* was Struthias.

Eunuchus bis die (Ritschl: deinceps) acta est meruitque pretium quantum nulla antea cuiusquam comoedia, i. e. (see Ritschl, Sueton. p. 503 sq) octo milia nummum, Suet. p. 29 R. Cf. Auctar. Donat. ib. p. 35 and Donatus' pref. to the Eun. Ritschl, Par. p. 330—333. Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XXI p. 68, n. 6.

The consuls of the year in which the play was first exhibited are not mentioned by Donatus; the didasc. of the Calliopian class mentions M. Valerius (593), C. (reg. and others: Cornel.) Mummius (608), Fannius (593); the aed. cur. in Donatus and in the Calliopian class L. Postumius Albinus (Cons. 600, consequently aedilis c. 594), L. Cornelius Merula (perhaps the father of the consul of 667 who bears the same name) and the performance ludis megalensibus; but in the Bemb. M. Junius

(Brutus, the jurisprudent, a vir praetorius?) and L. Julius (Caesar, the father of the cognominous Consul of 664?), ludis romanis. Hence we may draw conclusions as to two performances, a. 593 (Coss. M. Valerius Messala, C. Fannius Strabo; aed. Albinus and Merula) and again 608 (Coss. Cn. Cornelius Lentulus, L. Mummius Achaicus; aed. Junius and Julius). See Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XXI p. 66—68.

F. Seybold, on Terence's Eunuchus, Pirmasenz 1785. Roos, super Ter. quibusdam locis, in his Essays on the Classics, p. 131—150. Böttiger, spec. novae ed. Ter., in his Opuscula p. 245—284.

3) Hauton timorumenos, the self-tormenter, after Menander's play of the same title, without the use of another play; a play of intrigue, with a somewhat extravagant plot, little delineation of character and in a dry tone.

Αὐτὸν (comp. Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XX p. 571, n. 1) *τιμωρούμενος* = se crucians (I 1, 29), se exercens (I 1, 94), ipse se poeniens (Cic. Tusc. III 27, 65).

Ex integra graeca integra comoedia, prol. 4; ib. 36 called stataria.

The consuls of the year of performance in the Bemb.: Cn. Cornelius, Marcus (ought to be Manius) Iuvenius (i. e. Iuvencius, Iuventius); in the other mss. M. Iunio, T. Sempronio, perhaps pointing to the year 591, in which Ti. Sempronius Gracchus II and M'. Iuventius Thalna were consuls, and to a revival under the consulship of some Cornelius (Cn. Cornelius Lentulus a. 608? P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio a. 616?) At the first performance (ludis megalensibus) perhaps aed. cur. L. Cornelius Lentulus (no doubt the ambassador of a. 592 in Polyb. XXXI 23 and Cons. 598) and L. Valerius Flaccus (Cons. 602?). See Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XX p. 584 sq. XXI p. 68 sq. 70, n. 11.

Lessing, Hamb. Dramat., no. 87 sq. Zimmermann, on Terence's Hautont., Hamburg 1829.

4) Phormio, so called from the parasite in the play, the original by Apollodorus of Carystus being entitled *Ἐπιδικαζόμενος*. The plot is interesting, the delineation of characters varied and detailed, the whole execution lively and merry.

On the title and original see prol. 25—28 together with Donatus, according to whom Apollodorus' play was rather entitled *Ἐπιδικαζομένη*. Comp. Meineke, hist. crit. com. gr. p. 464—466.

The didascalia in the Bemb. is: acta ludis megalensibus Q. Caspione Cn. Servilio cos. Graeca Apollodoru Epidicazomenos. Facta est III. In the cod. Bas. the coss. are G. Fannius, M. Valerius, and the same are given in Donatus' preface; the mss. of the Calliopian class and Donatus have also ludis romanis. The latter report the first exhibition a. 593, under the Aediles Albinus and Merula; the Bemb. has a later revival, perhaps a. 712, coss. Cn. Servilius Caepio and Q. Pompeius, this being

more probable than a. 614, Coss. C. Laelius and Q. Servilius Caepio. Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XX p. 575. XXI p. 70—72.

Ter. Phormio ad. C. G. Elberling, Kopenh. 1861.

C. A. Böttiger, de pers. scen. ad. Ter. Phorm. I 4, 32. Weimar 1794. J. Wollenberg, the Ph. collated with a ms. of the 13th century at Tours, in Mützell's Ztschfr. XIV p. 888—893. C. H. Humbert, Le Phormion de Térence et les Fourberies de Scapin de Molière, progr. of Elberfeld 1854. 4.

5) Hecyra, the mother-in-law, a play of peculiar characters and almost destitute of plot; hence it was not to the taste of the Roman public and its performance was long attended with difficulties.

The plot turns only upon pathetic affections, and the final solution concerns only difficulties of the sentiments. In his characters the Greek poet seems to have intended a deviation from the ordinary routine. The explanation of the plot is given through *πρόσωπα προτατικά*.

As the Latin possesses a word of its own (socrus) for *ἑκυρά*, it is almost certain that this play (comp. the Adelphoe) is an adaptation of a Greek play, entitled *Ἑκυρά*. Such a one is not known, but there is no reason to doubt Donatus' notice: fabula Apollodori (Carystii) dicitur esse graeca, espec. as he repeats it five times in his commentary, quoting the words of Apollodorus (comp. Meineke, fragm. com. gr. p. 1104 sq. ed. min.). The notice in the Bemb.: graeca Menandru, may perhaps have been caused by Sidon. Apollin. Ep. IV 12, who mentions Menander's *Ἐπιτρέποντες* as a fabula similis argumenti (to the Hec.), though it is doubtful how far this similarity extended. At the very utmost, the *πρόσωπα προτατικά* might be assumed to have been taken from Menander's play. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 1700 note. Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XXI p. 76—78. 80 sq. Comp. Fr. V. Fritzsche, Lectiones Terentianae, Rostock 1860. 4. p. 21—26.

The didasc. would agree with the facts, if it were facta II (it is, however, V). acta ludis megalensibus Sex. Iulio Caesare (cons. 597), Cn. Cornelio Dolabella (cons. 595) aedilibus cur., Cn. Octavio T. Manlio coss. (a. 589 = 165). primum acta sine prologo (when the performance was interrupted by funambuli, prol. I 4). relata est iterum L. Aemilio Paulo ludis funeralibus (a. 595; see prol. I). non est placita (cf. prol. II 33 sqq.). tertio relata est (prol. II) Q. Fulvio (Cons. 601) L. Marcio (Cons. 605) aed. cur. (on the ludi romani of a. V. C. 594). placuit. (This was followed by Terence's departure to the East.) See Dziatzko, Rh. Mus. XX p. 576 sqq. XXI p. 72—76. Ritschl in Reiff.'s Suetonius p. 500 sq.

6) Adelphoe, from Menander's *Ἀδελφοί*, with the addition of a scene from the beginning of Diphilos' *Συναποθνήσκοντες*. The simple and well-contrived plot, careful delineation of characters and prevailing cheerfulness, render this play the

most successful of Terence. But the sceptical manner, in which at last the new and old time are contrasted with each other, is not very pleasing.

Acta ludis funeralibus Lucio Aemilio Paulo, quos fecere Q. Fabius Maxumus, P. Cornelius Africanus . . Facta sexta, M. Cornelio Cethego, L. (Anicio) Gallo coss. (a. 594 = 160). It has, however, been shown to be probable by Wilmanns and Dziatzko that this performance was not the first (see Rh. Mus. XX p. 577 sq. XXI p. 78—82). Donatus, praef. Ad., says: hanc dicunt ex Terentianis secundo loco actam; but funeral games used to take place a few days after the death of the person in question, and the preparation for a new play could scarcely have been finished so soon; the prologue, moreover, is written in a very modest manner, and Haut. prol. 17 (multas contaminaase graecas etc.) presupposes the existence of more than one contaminated play, whence that notice of Donatus' seems very probable.

On its relation to the Greek plays: prol. 6 sqq. Grauert, Analekten p. 124—147. Ihne, Quaest. p. 25—38. W. Teuffel, Rhein. Mus. VIII p. 45—47.

On the concluding scene see W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. VIII p. 47—50. For a further criticism of the play see Lessing, Hamburg. Dramat. No. 71 sq. 97—100. Zimmermann, on Terence and Menander, a contribution to the explanation of the Ad., Clausthal 1824. K. Fr. Hermann, de Ter. Adelphis, Marburg 1838. 4. = Jahn's Jahrb. Suppl. VI p. 65—79.

Holtze, Notes on several passages in the Ad., in Jahn's Jahrb. Suppl. XI p. 1—23. Speck, Obs. crit. in Ter. Ad., Breslau 1847. Rotter, ad Ter. Ad. excursus de sono versuum, Bresl. 1846. 4. A. Klette, Adelphon Terentianae emendationes, in the Symbola philolog. Bonn. p. 843—848.

---

1. Complete editions of Terence. Editio princeps: Argentorati apud Mentelin, 1470 fol. An edition s. l. e. a., according to Salomonsen, in Jahn's Archive IV. 1836. p. 325—330, printed in Italy about 1470 or 1475. Then Ven. 1476 together with Donatus; cum not. Mureti, Ven. 1555. 8.; emend. a Faërno, Florent. 1565; c. Donati et Eugraphii comm. ed. Lindenbrogius, Paris 1602. Francof. 1623; c. annot. Boecleri, accedunt comm. Guyeti, Argentorati 1657; Latin et franç. par Mad. Dacier, Paris 1688. 12. III voll.; ex rec. et c. not. R. Bentleji, Cantabr. et Lond. 1726; reprinted by Vollbehr, Kiel 1846; comm. perp. illustr., acced. Donatus, Eugraphius, Calphurnius, etc., cur. Westerhovius, Hag. Com. 1726. 4. II voll., [the school-edition] reprinted by Stallbaum, Lips. 1830; ed. Zeune, Lips. 1774; ed. Bothe in Poet. scen. T. IV, Mannhem. 1837; ed. Perlet, Lips. 1821; ed. Reinhardt, Lips. 1827; illustr. Lemaire, Paris 1827. III voll.; ed. Elberling, Havniae 1834; rec. A. Fleckeisen, Lips. Teubner 1857; with notes, by W. Wagner, Cambridge 1869; appar. crit. instr. F. Umpfenbach, Berol. 1870.

[2. The best English translation by G. Colman, reprinted London 1841.]

3. General exegetical works: Ruhnkenii dictata ed. Schopen, Bonn 1825. Gronovii notae in Ter., ed. Frotscher, Lips. 1833. G. Hermann, de Bentlejo eiusque edit. Terent., Opusc. II. F. V. Fritzsche, quaest. Ter. spec. I, Rostoch. 1849. 4.; Lectiones Terentianae (I. De Ter. codice Rostochiensi. II. de graecis Ter. fontibus), Rostoch. 1860. 26 pp. 4. 1862. 8 pp. 4. Jos. Krauss, Quaestiones Terentianae criticae, Bonn 1850. 48 pp. 8. A. Klette, exercitationes Terentianae, Bonn 1855. 23 pp. 8. Reinhardt, on a new edition of Ter., Hildburghausen 1855. 19 pp. 4. J. Brix, de Ter. fabulis post R. Bentleium emendandis, Liegnitz 1857. 18 pp. 4. Th. Ladewig, Contributions to the criticism of Terence, Neustrelitz 1858. 26 pp. 4.

100. Terence's individual character as a poet consists negatively in the absence of originality, and positively in the quality of correctness and partly also of elegance. He faithfully adheres to his Greek originals, and avails himself of other Greek plays where he feels obliged to curtail them and enliven the action. His plots are somewhat monotonous, nor is there much variety in the names of his characters. He does not possess the liveliness, freshness and versatility of Plautus, but he is free from his extravagances. He succeeds best in quiet conversation, not so well in the language of passion, and he is sadly deficient in comic power. The plots of his plays are smooth and polished, his characters consistent and carefully delineated. He is a refined poet, more to the taste of noble connoisseurs than of the people. His language, too, shows every where smoothness and elegance. His verses are not so varied or lively as those of Plautus, but they are more polished and severe.

1. On Terence see in general Th. Ladewig in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 1695—1701. Bohtz, on the comic element and Comedy, p. 196 sq. Mommsen, H. R. II² p. 433—437. The plays are examined and criticised by M. Rapp, Hist. of the Greek drama (Tüb. 1862) p. 269—291. 297—302. J. L. Klein, History of the Drama, II (Leipzig 1865) p. 567—635.

2. How did he treat his originals? Fabulae eius extant quatuor e Menandro translatae, Andria Eunuchus Adelphoe Hautontimorumenos; duae ex Apollodoro Caricio (i. e. Carystio), Hecyra et Phormio (vit. Ambros. in Mai, Fragm. Plauti et Ter. p. 38. so also Donatus' additam. to Suetonius' Vita). On his manner of using the Greek plays see Meineke ad Menandr. p. 1—9. 19—22. 67—79. 98—100. 140—142. Grauert, Hist. and phil. Anal. p. 116—208. Benfey in the Introd. to his translation. Könighoff, de ratione quam Ter. in fab. gr. lat. con-

vertendis secutus est, Cologne 1843. W. Ihne, Quaestiones Ter., Bonn 1843. Th. Ladewig, on the canon of Volc. Sedigitus 1842, and Contributions to the criticism of Terence, 1858, p. 1—10.

3. His want of originality manifests itself also in his frequent use of contamination, cleverly as he usually manages it. Ter. generally altered the names of his originals, especially so as to denote by the name alone the character of the part. His lovers are called Phaedria, Charinus, Chaerea and Pamphilus; his girls Pamphila, Philumena, Bacchis; the slaves Geta, Syrus, Parmeno etc. This habit makes it difficult to retain a definite idea of individual characters and plays. Moreover, the love of a young man for a girl who finally turns out to be of free birth and is married by him, forms the plot of Andria, Eun., Haut., Phormio; in the Hec., too, there is a kind of *ἀναγνωρισμός*, and in the Ad. alone the beloved girl is a person of low rank. — Ter. changed also the metres of his originals according to his pleasure or necessity. — The explanation of the plot was often facilitated by the introduction of *πρόσωπα προτατικά*, see above § 16, 8.

4. Quintil. X 1, 99: Terentii scripta .. sunt in hoc genere elegantissima et plus adhuc habitura gratiae, si intra versus trimetros stetissent (because Ter. was destitute of spirit for a higher style).

5. Poor puns: Andr. 218. — Eun. prol. 42. 45. Haut. 218. — Haut. 356. 379. 526. Hec. 543. Ad. 220 etc.

6. Gell. VI (VII) 14, 6: vera et propria .. exempla in latina lingua M. Varro esse dicit .. mediocritatis Terentium.

7. Afranius in Compitalibus: Terenti numne similem dicent quempiam? (Ritschl, Sueton. p. 523) and perhaps also v. 30: ut quidquid loquitur sal merumst! Cic. ad Attic. VII 3, 10: Terentium, cuius fabellae propter elegantiam sermonis etc., and in Limone (ap. Suet.) ... lecto sermone, Terenti, .. Menandrum in medium nobis sedatis motibus affers, etc. Caesar (ap. Sueton.) .. puri sermonis amator. Lenibus atque utinam scriptis adiuncta foret vis, Comica ut aequato virtus polleret honore Cum Graecis neve hac despectus parte iaceres! Caesar calls him, therefore, only dimidiatus Menander.

8. E. Kärchner, Prosodiacal observations on Plautus and Terence, Karlsruhe 1846. Liebig, de hiatu in versibus Ter., Breslau 1848. 8. and de genetivi usu Terent. Oels 1853. 26 pp. 4.; the hypothetical sentences in Ter. Görlitz 1863. 36 pp. 4. Heinrichs, de ablativi apud Ter. usu et ratione, P. I. Elbing 1858. 28 pp. 4. II. Elbing 1860. 26 pp. 4.

101. The first writer of togatae of whom we know is Titinius, of a respectable plebeian family, a contemporary of Terence, whom he seems, however, to have survived. All his plays bear Latin titles and their plots prove them to have been tabernariae. The fragments show a forcible and popular tone, an accomplished,

lively and fresh manner reminding one of Plautus, while in consistent delineation of character Titinius was ranked with Terence, and this is also apparent in female parts.

1. Varro ap. Charis. II p. 215: ἦθη nullis aliis servare convenit (contigit?) quam Titinio, Terentio, Attae. Ritschl Par. p. 194 sq. concludes from there words that Titinius was born before Terence; but as he commenced to write at an early age, and as the existence of togatae during Ter.'s literary career is improbable and cannot be proved, Tit. may have begun to write after the death of Ter. See Mommsen, H. R. I² p. 885 n. 1.

2. Seren. Samm. med. 1045: Titini sententia ... qui veteri claras expressit more togatas.

3. We know of 15 titles; the fragments in Bothe, poet. scen. V 2 p. 58—76. Neukirch, fab. tog. p. 102—152. Ribbeck, com. p. 115—137. On Tit. see Neukirch, l. l. p. 97—101. Ritschl, Par. p. 194 sq. Ladewig in Pauly's Encycl. VI 2. p. 2014, n. 11. Mommsen, H. of R. I² p. 885 sq.

102. Turpilius, also a contemporary of Terence, adhered to the palliata; he lived far into the seventh century V. C. He, like Terence, translated Greek plays of the middle and New Comedy into Latin. The general tone in his fragments is more lively than in the lines of Caecilius and Terence; his diction abounds in popular elements, his metres are like those of Terence.

1. Jerome on Euseb. chr. ol. 169, 2 = 103 B. Chr. = 651 V. C.; Turpilius comicus senex admodum Sinuessae moritur.

2. The fragments in Bothe, scen. lat. V 2 p. 77—94. P. Grautoff, Turpil. comoediarum reliquiae, Bonn 1853. 52 pp. 8. Ribbeck, com. p. 73—96.

3. Of the 13 titles known to us, all of which are in Greek, six agree with titles of Menander, the Demetrius was adapted from Alexis, Lemniae or Philopator from Antiphanes. 'It is probable that T. soon gave up writing for the stage, as the close of the sixth century coincides with the end of the palliata, which was no longer encouraged by popular favour.' Ritschl, Par. p. 188 note.

103. Iuventius and Valerius were other poets of palliatae in this period; Q. Fabius Labeo and M. Popillius Laenas are not otherwise known as poets.

1. Iuventius comicus ap. Varro L. L. VII 65, comp. VI 50. Iuventius in comoedia, Gell. XVIII 12, 2. Iuventius in Anagnorizomene, Fest. p. 298 v. summussi rests on mere conjecture (see O. Müller p. 407).

Paul. Diac. (p. 299 M.) substituted the collective appellation for the later palliata, viz. Terentius. — Ribbeck, com. p. 70 sq.

2. Valerius (perhaps identical with Val. Aedituus, who is called vetus poeta by Gellius XIX 9, 10 and placed before Licinus and Catulus), the author of a Phormio, Ribbeck com. p. 72.

3. Anonymous titles of palliatae are Adelphi, Hydria, Georgos: Ribb. com. p. 96 sq.

4. On Facius and Popillius (Cons. 581) see below 114, 5.

104. Of the inscriptions of the 6th century only a few are metrical and of any length.

1. On the inscr. in Saturnians see above 52, 8. Among the epitaphs of the Scipios n. 33 and 34 ap. Mommsen (C. I. lat. I p. 19 sq.) belong to this period, perhaps also the inscription of Sora (C. I. I. 1175), unless it be of the beginning of the 7th century.

2. Of the epitaphs of Naevius (see 83, 1), Plautus (84, 2), Ennius (89, 6), Pacuvius (94, 1) — all of them preserved by later writers — the first is in Saturnian metre, the second (which is scarcely genuine) in hexameters, the third in elegiacs, the 4th in iambic senarii.

II. Prose-writers.

105. Of the earliest Roman historians who wrote in Greek (see above 31), the oldest and most important is Q. Fabius Pictor, of the time of the second Punic war. His *ἱστορία* extended from Aeneas until his own time, treating of the latter at greater length. Polybius and Dionysius frequently find fault with him; but the first uses him as his principal authority in the second Punic war, and Livy seems to follow him in more details than he confesses. Besides the Greek work, there was also a later version in Latin. Works on the ius pontificium are attributed to him with little or no authority.

1. Dionys. Ant. I 6: *ὁμοίας δὲ τούτοις* (the Greek writers on Roman history) *καὶ οὐδὲν διαφόρους ἐξέδωκαν ἱστορίας καὶ Ῥωμαίων ὅσοι τὰ παλαιὰ ἔργα τῆς πόλεως ἑλληνικῇ διαλέκτῳ συνέγραψαν, ὧν εἰσι πρεσβύτατοι Κόιντός τε Φάβιος καὶ Λεύκιος Κίγκιος, ἀμφότεροι κατὰ τοὺς φοινικικοὺς ἀκμάσαντες πολέμους. τούτων, δὲ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἑκάτερος οἷς μὲν αὐτὸς ἔργοις παρεγένετο διὰ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἀκριβῶς ἀνέγραψε, τὰ δὲ ἀρχαῖα τὰ μετὰ τὴν κτίσιν τῆς πόλεως γενόμενα κεφαλαιωδῶς ἐπέδραμεν.* Polyb. III 9: *κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς* (of the second Punic war) *ὁ γράφων* (Fab. P.) *γέγονε καὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου μετεῖχε τῶν Ῥωμαίων.* Livy XXII 7, 4 (at the battle of the Trasimene lake): Fabium aequalem

temporibus huiusce belli potissimum auctorem habui. For a more accurate definition of the time of Fabius Pictor see Eutrop. III 5: L. Aemilio cos. (529 V. C.) ingentes Gallorum copiae Alpes transierunt. sed pro Romanis tota Italia consensit traditumque est a Fabio historico, qui ei bello interfuit etc. So also Oros. IV 13, comp. Plin. N. H. X 34. After the battle of Cannae (538) Q. Fabius Pictor Delphos ad oraculum missus est (Liv. XXII 57, 5, comp. XXIII 11, 1 sqq.). Plut. Fab. Max. 18: *εἰς Δελφοὺς ἐπέμφθη θεοπρόπος Πίκτωρ συγγενὴς Φαβίου* (the Cunctator). App. Hann. 27: *ἡ βουλὴ Κόιντον Φάβιον, τὸν συγγραφέα τῶνδε τῶν ἔργων, ἐς Δελφοὺς ἔπεμπε* etc. On his father and son see Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 2911 sq. n. 31 and 38.

2. Liv. I 44, 2: scriptorum antiquissimus Fabius Pictor. II 40, 10: Fabium, longe antiquissimum auctorem. Dionys. VII 71: *Κοΐντῳ Φαβίῳ βεβαιωτῇ χρώμενος καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς ἔτι δεόμενος πίστεως ἑτέρας. παλαιότατος γὰρ ἀνὴρ τῶν τὰ ῥωμαϊκὰ συνταξαμένων καὶ πίστιν οὐκ ἐξ ὧν ἤκουσε μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸς ἔγνω παρεχόμενος.* But IV 6 and 30, in an insignificant detail, D. censures his *ῥᾳθυμία*. Polyb. I 14 says that he undertook the history of the Punic war *διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐμπειρότατα δοκοῦντας γράφειν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, Φιλῖνον καὶ Φάβιον, μὴ δεόντως ἡμῖν ἀπηγγελκέναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ἐκόντας μὲν οὖν ἐψεῦσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας οὐχ ὑπολαμβάνω, στοχαζόμενος ἐκ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς αἱρέσεως αὐτῶν*, but Pictor (he says) was misled by his patriotic leaning to the Romans; comp. ib. 58. III 8 and 9 Polybius speaks of Pictor in his crotchety manner; see Mommsen R. H. I² p. 910. Th. Lucas in the progr. of Glogau 1854, p. 10—18. Livy I 55, 8: magis Fabio, praeterquam quod antiquior est, crediderim .. quam Pisoni. He quotes him again VIII 30, 9. X 37, 14, but even in mentioning in a general manner antiquissimos scriptores or priscos annales or vetustiores scriptores, he seems to mean espec. Pictor. Comp. W. Harless, de Fab. p. 33—35.

3. The fragments of Pictor in A. Krause, vitae et fragm. vett. hist. rom. p. 52 sqq. and C. L. Roth (app. to Gerlach's Sallust of 1852) p. 250—259. W. Harless, de Fab. p. 13—33. Treatises on him (besides D. G. Moller, Altorf 1689. 4.) by H. K. Whitte (Copenh. 1832), A. Krause (l. l. p. 38 sqq.), Exp. Baumgart (Breslau 1842, 52 pp. 8.), W. Harless (de Fabiis et Aufidiis rer. rom. scriptoribus, Bonn 1853 p. 1—12), K. W. Nitzsch (Q. F. Pictor's account of the first years of the war with Hannibal, Allgem. Monatsschrift, Brunswick 1854, p. 67—84), Du Rieu (Disp. de gente Fabia, Lugd. Bat. 1856, p. 165—199), L. Kieserling (de rer. rom. script., Berlin 1858, p. 7—18). Also W. A. Becker, Roman antiquities I p. 39 sqq. A. Schwegler, H. of Rome I p. 74—77. F. D. Gerlach, the Roman historians p. 34—44.

4. Plut. Rom. 3: *τὰ κυριώτατα* (of early Roman history) *πρῶτος εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐξέδωκε Διοκλῆς ὁ Πεπαρήθιος, ᾧ καὶ Φάβιος Πίκτωρ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ἐπηκολούθησε.* The agreement in facts between Pictor and this otherwise unknown Diocles may be more justly explained from their using the same sources (Schwegler I p. 412—414), or

(as Schwegler thinks p. 414) by assuming that Diocles used the Roman annalists. Comp. Kieserling p. 15 sq.

5. As Latin passages are repeatedly quoted from Fabius Pictor as his authentic expressions (e. g. spelunca Martis, lupus as a feminine, duoetvicesimo anno, the last in Gellius V 4, 3), we are obliged to assume a Latin version. This must, however, have been later than the original Greek, as it presupposes a higher development of Latin prose, the earliest work in which is Cato's Origines (hence in Cic. de or. II 12, 51: ut noster Cato, ut Pictor, ut Piso, and ib. 53: talis noster Cato et Pictor et Piso; but de leg. I 2, 6 where the historical fact is mentioned, in another order: ad Fabium aut Catonem aut ad Pisonem). It may be doubted whether the Latin version was made by the author himself, or (as in the case of Acilius) by another, perhaps also called Fabius. But the supposition that there were two famous annalists of the name of Fabius is not supported by this. Many scholars (e. g. Krause, Baumgart, Kieserling) take this second to be the jurist Servius Fabius Pictor, others again Fabius Maximus Servilianus (Cons. 612), of whom it is, at all events, certain that he wrote historical works. Numerius can no longer be put forward, as in the passage of Cicero (de div. I 21, 43: Aeneae somnium, quod in ñi Fabi Pictoris graecis annalibus eiusmodi est) M. Hertz (Philological and clinical excursion p. 32 sqq. Rh. Mus. XVII p. 579, n. 8) has explained ni as nostri, not as Sigonius did, as numeri. But from Cicero's words we may also conclude that the Latin version of Fabius' annals did not contain the dream of Aeneas at all or at least not at such length, that it was therefore a kind of abridgment. This was also divided (either by the author himself or somebody else) into books; the first book is quoted de orig. gent. rom. 20, 1 and Non. p. 518, 28; the fourth Gell. V 4, 3. Dionys. A. I 79: *Κόιντος Φάβιος ὁ Πίκτωρ λεγόμενος . . ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ γράφει* is doubtful, as in other places Dionysius does not quote according to books.

6. It is plausible that Fabius Pictor did not commence his Greek work before the end of the second Punic war, and that he brought it down to its close; but there are no positive proofs of these assumptions.

7. Festus p. 250, fin.: puilio saxa esse ad portum qui sit secundum Tiberim ait Fabius Pictor, quem locum putat Labeo dici etc. Labeo being no doubt the jurist Antistius Labeo, it seems very probable that this quotation refers to a work of F. P. de iure pontificio. Its author may, however, be found in the jurist F. P. (see below 129, 3) with at least as much reason as in the annalist. Non. Marc. p. 518: Fabius Pictor Rerum gestarum lib. I: "et simul videbant picum Martium". Idem iuris pontificii libro III. This shows only that both the annalist and the jurist bore the name F. P., and that Nonius considered them identical.

106. Pictor's younger contemporary, L. Cincius Alimentus, praetor 544 sq., wrote a similar work, also in Greek, and as it seems, not without critically availing himself of historical sources. This annalist has, however, become a somewhat uncertain figure by his being frequently confounded with a later person of the same name.

1. Dionys. I 74: *Λεύκιος Κίγκιος, ἀνὴρ ἐκ τοῦ βουλευτικοῦ συνεδρίου,* (places the foundation of Rome) *περὶ τὸ τέταρτον ἔτος τῆς δωδεκάτης ὀλυμπιάδος* (Mommsen, Roman Chronology, sec. ed., p. 315 sqq. Pluess p. 34 sqq.) Liv. XXI 38, 3: L. Cincius Alimentus, qui captum se ab Hannibale (at all events after his praetorship, prob. a. 546) scribit. XXVI 23, 1: praetorum inde comitia habita. P. Manlius Vulso . . et L. Cincius Alimentus creati sunt. XXVII 7, 12: legiones decretae: M. Valerio cum Cincio (his quoque est enim prorogatum in Sicilia imperium) Cannensis exercitus datus. See also ib. XXVI 28, 3. XXVII 5. 8, 16. 26, 3. 28, 17. 29, 4.

2. Liv. VII 3, 7: Volsiniis quoque clavos indices numeri annorum fixos in templo Nortiae etruscae deae comparere diligens talium monumentorum auctor Cincius adfirmat. If we understand the present tense comparere of a Cincius of the 7th century (as Mercklin does), it would have no other sense than when understood of the older one. Besides this, Livy never quotes other than historical works. We should, therefore, be obliged to follow Pluess (p. 17 sqq. 25 sqq.) in thinking of a contemporary of Livy. — More on Cincius' work in Dionys. I 6; see above 105, 1. Ib. 79: *περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἰλίας γενομένων Κόιντος μὲν Φάβιος . . ᾧ Λεύκιός τε Κίγκιος καὶ Κάτων Πόρκιος καὶ Πίσων Καλπούρνιος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγγραφέων οἱ πλείους ἠκολούθησαν.* Comp. II 38. 39. Liv. XXI 38, 3—5: L. Cincius Alimentus . . maxime auctor me moveret, nisi confunderet numerum Gallis Liguribusque additis . . ex ipso autem audisse se Hannibale etc. Cincius' statement is defended by Lachmann, de font. Liv. II p. 80 sqq., comp. Pluess p. 5—8. The silence of other writers (e. g. Polybius) about him may be explained from the coincidence of his subject with the work of Fabius.

3. The fragments of Cincius in Krause p. 63—68. M. Hertz, Cinc. p. 17—21 and C. L. Roth (1852) p. 259—262. Essays: H. Liebaldt, hist. rom. reliq. spec. De L. Cincio Al. Diss. Halle 1833. p. 9 sqq. M. Hertz, de Luciis Cinciis, Cinciorum fragm. ed. Berlin 1842. 112 pp. 8. Schwegler I p. 78—80. Gerlach, Roman historians p. 44—52. Kieserling, de rer. rom. script. p. 18—22. J. Th. Pluess, de Cinciis rerum rom. scriptoribus, Bonn 1865, 45 pp. comp. New Swiss Museum VI (1866) p. 43 sqq.

4. We find also attributed to Cincius (see Hertz p. 32—60) a book de fastis (Macrob. Sat. I 12, 12, comp. *Κίγκιος ἐν τῷ περὶ ἑορτῶν* ap. Lyd. de mens. IV 92 and ib. IV 44 *Κίγκιος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος σοφιστής*), de comitiis (Fest. v. patricios, p. 241 M.), de consulum potestate (Fest. v.

praetor, p. 241 M.), de officio iurisconsulti (from which Festus quotes, v. nuncupata pecunia, p. 173 M., and p. 321, a second book is mentioned), mystagogica (the second book quoted by Festus v. trientem, p. 363 M.), de re militari (the 3rd, 5th and 6th books are quoted by Gell. XVI 4), de verbis priscis (in Festus espec. p. 214. 277. 330 M.). It seems, however, probable and has, moreover, been shown by Hertz l. l. p. 61 sqq. that all these political and antiquarian works are by a later jurist Cincius. While Hertz places him in the Ciceronian period and identifies him with the L. Cincius who occurs in the correspondence of Cicero, Pluess removes him into the Augustan period, a supposition supported by the enumeration in Arnob. adv. gent. III 38 and Charis. inst. gramm. I 21, 124 = p. 107 P. = p. 132, 30 K. (Varro et Tullius et Cincius). He would, therefore, at least have been a younger contemporary of Cicero. Pluess also conjectures that this Cincius (c. 729 V. C.) wrote annals, which were frequently (e. g. by Dionys. of Halic.) confounded with the works of the earlier annalist of the same name, espec. as the later Cincius might have incorporated the work of his ancestor into his own.

107. The national tendencies in the whole life and in literature are in the 6th century V. C. most zealously represented by M. Porcius Cato, born at Tusculum a. V. C. 520, quaestor 550, aedilis 555, praetor 556, Consul 559 = 195 B. C., Censor 570 = 184, died 605. A firm and strong character, fully aware of his purposes and following them now with indomitable energy, now with cunning; eager for strife, and full of shrewd common sense, Cato is the archetype of an old Roman. But then he also betrays the influence of his time in the vanity with which he loved to show himself to the greatest advantage, and in his often glaring egotism. In politics, he was without the farsightedness of his aristocratic adversaries, though no one surpassed him in well-meaning patriotism. In spite of the small esteem he professed for literary composition, he was a prolific writer, and he is indeed the first real prose-writer of the Romans.

1. Cato's (= Sapiens) surnames: Censor, Censorius, Orator, later distinguished from the Vticensis by the addition of priscus or superior. For his manysidedness see Quint. XII 11, 23: M. Cato idem summus imperator, idem sapiens, idem orator, idem historiae conditor, idem iuris, idem rerum rusticarum peritissimus fuit. Comp. Cic. de or. III 33, 135, and below 10, 2. Liv. XXXIX 40 gives an eloquent and admiring characterism of Cato, though he does not expressly mention his Origines. On his life and character see the biographies by Cornelius Nepos and Cicero's Cato, Plutarch's *βίος Κάτωνος*, Victor vir. illustr. 47; of modern writers espec. W. Drumann, H. of Rome V p. 97—148.

See also J. G. Schneider, de M. Porcii Catonis vita, studiis, scriptis in his Scriptores rei rusticae, T. I. G. C. Brillenburg, de . . Catone Censorio, Lugd. Bat. 1826. W. E. Weber, de . . Catonis vita et moribus, Bremen 1831. 4. Wilms, Catonis Censorii vita et fragmenta, Dortmund 1839. 1843. 4. Th. Renvall, de . . Catone Censorio, Helsingförs 1845. H. Dohrn, on Cato the Elder and his life, Itzehoe 1845. 4. W. Teuffel, in Pauly's Encycl. V p. 1904—1911. Mommsen, Roman history I[2] p. 846 sqq.

2. J. H. v. Bolhuis, diatribe in . . Catonis scripta, Utrecht 1826. A. Lion, Catoniana, sive . . Catonis Censorii quae supersunt operum fragmenta, Gött. 1826. H. Jordan, M. Catonis praeter librum de re rustica quae extant, Lips. 1860 (CIX pp. of Prolegomena, and 135 pp. of fragments). O. Ribbeck, on M. Porcius Cato Cens. as a writer, in the New Swiss Museum I (Bern 1861) p. 7—33. See also H. Jordan, Quaestionum Caton. capita II, Berlin 1856.

3. Cic. Brut. 18, 69 of Cato: cum ita sit ad nostrorum temporum rationem vetus ut nullius scriptum exstet dignum quidem lectione quod sit antiquius. Comp. ib. 16, 61: nec vero habeo quemquam antiquiorem, cuius quidem scripta proferenda putem, nisi quem Appi Caeci oratio . . et nonnullae mortuorum laudationes forte delectant. But there is no doubt that Cato was the first who wrote and published a large number of works (some of them of great extent) in Latin prose.

108. Cato who until the end of his life took part in all public affairs in the most energetic manner, and opposed incessantly the predominant party and the Grecian tendencies of his age, had ample opportunity of showing his natural eloquence. He was also the first Roman who wrote down and published his speeches. Cicero knew of more than 150 of them; we know only of 80, beginning in the year of Cato's consulship, either in fragments or from the events which caused them. These 80 are pretty equally divided between judicial and political speeches, the latter delivered either before the senate or an assembly of the people. The fragments show natural eloquence, and practice in all effective modulations, humour and earnestness, self-praise and cutting raillery.

1. Cornel. Nep. Cat. 3, 3 says inaccurately: ab adolescentia confecit (rather habuit) orationes. More justly Cicero (Cato mai. 11, 38) lets him say: causarum illustrium quascumque defendi nunc (i. e. in senectute) cum maxime conficio orationes. Among those known to us as published speeches we find some which we can prove never to have been actually delivered (in M'. Acilium of a. 565, see Jordan p. LXXVI). See above 36, 7.

2. Cic. Brut. 17, 65: refertae sunt orationes amplius centum quinquaginta, quas quidem adhuc invenerim et legerim, et verbis et rebus illustribus. The titles and fragments preserved have been collected (besides Bolhuis and Lion, see 107, 2) by H. Meyer, orat. rom. fragm., sec. ed., p. 11—151 (who increased the number to 93 speeches) and more lucidly by H. Jordan, Caton. q. exst. p. 33—74, comp. p. LXI—XCVIII. A résumé p. XCV: earum quas cognovimus Catonis orationum dimidia fere pars in iudiciis causisque versatur, in suadendis dissuadendisque legibus atque in sententiis senatoriis altera pars. Several of them dealt with cases of civil law; ib. p. LXXXVII—LXXXIX. We know only six speeches in his own defence (ib. p. XCV sq.), though we know that Cato was 44 times accused by his adversaries without, however, sentence being more than once passed against him (Plin. N. H. VII 27, 100. Victor vir. ill. 47, 7. Plut. Cat. 15. comp. 2. Val. Max. III 7, 7. Ampel. lib. mem. 19, 8). Speeches of this class were of course only improvised, nor did Cato like to hand down to posterity the charges raised against him. Chance, moreover, seems to have something to do with this, because Livy XXXIX 40 mentions also orationes pro se multae among his scripta omnis generis.[1]

3. Cato's speeches were long preserved by the rhetors and grammarians and the antiquarian fashion of the 2nd century (e. g. Hadrian Ciceroni Catonem praetulit, Spart. Hadr. 16, 6). In the fourth century of the Christian era they were known to Servius (ad Aen. VII 259. XI 301) and Marius Victorinus (Boeth. in Cic. Top. I p. 271 Or.) Jordan p. XCVI.

4. The best (Jordan p. XCVII sq.) characterism of Cato's style is given by Gellius N. A. VI 3, 17 sqq. 52 sq., e. g. 53: ea omnia distinctius numerosiusque fortassean dici potuerint, fortius atque vividius potuisse dici non videntur. Cicero's descriptions (esp. Brut. 16, 63 sqq. 85, 293 sq. de or. I 37, 171. orat. 45, 152) are partly confused in their expressions, partly impaired by the endeavour to use Cato as shield and foil for himself. Quintil. II 5, 21 expresses himself intelligently. In a general manner Ampelius says 19, 8: hic est omnium rerum peritissimus et, ut Sallustio Crispo videtur, romani generis disertissimus. But Verrius Flaccus wrote already de obscuris Catonis (Gell. XVII 6, 2 sq.). Modern literature on Cato as a speaker: E. Schober, diss. de Catone Cens. oratore, Neisse 1825. 4. F. Ellendt, historia eloq. rom. 13—15. A. Westermann, Hist. of Roman eloquence, 23—27, p. 37—53.

109. Cato composed also the first Roman historical work in Latin prose, his seven books of Origines, commenced in the later years of his life and continued until nearly his death. The work comprised also the other tribes of Italy, including Upper Italy, at the same time dealing with ethnography and all sides of life to an extent which remained without imitation. In all the rest, the work was in the manner of the Annalists,

now brief, now extensive and even allowing space for the insertion of complete speeches by the author.

1. Cornel. Nep. Cat. 3, 3 sq.: senex (i. e. probably not before his sixtieth year, 580 V. C.) historias scribere instituit. earum sunt libri VII. primus continet res gestas regum populi rom.; secundus et tertius unde quaeque civitas orta sit italica; ob quam rem omnes Origines videtur appellasse. in quarto autem bellum poenicum est primum (perhaps with a summary account of the preceding years of the republic), in quinto secundum. atque haec omnia capitulatim sunt dicta (according to the principal events, distinguishing memorable actions and sayings, Jordan p. LIV). reliquaque bella pari modo persecutus est, usque ad praeturam Ser. Galbae (rather until 605, see n. 2) qui diripuit Lusitanos. atque horum bellorum duces (e. g. Hannibal, Maharbal, but no doubt also the Roman generals descended from the aristocratic families so little loved by the author; comp. Plin. N. H. VIII 5, 11: Cato, cum imperatorum nomina annalibus detraxerit, eum qui fortissime proeliatus esset in poenica acie Surum tradidit vocatum) non nominavit, sed sine nominibus res notavit. in eisdem exposuit quae in Italia Hispaniisque aut fierent aut viderentur admiranda (i. e. memorable, *θαυμάσια, παράδοξα*). in quibus (probably the whole work) multa industria et diligentia comparet, nulla doctrina (no book-learning, see Jordan p. LX). Dionys. Ant. I 11: *Πόρκιος Κάτων, ὁ τὰς γενεαλογίας τῶν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ πόλεων ἐπιμελέστατα συναγαγών.* ib. 74: *Κάτων Πόρκιος ἑλληνικὸν μὲν οὐχ ὁρίζει χρόνον* (as the year of the foundation of Rome), *ἐπιμελὴς δὲ γενόμενος εἰ καί τις ἄλλος περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν τῆς ἀρχαιολογουμένης ἱστορίας ἔτεσιν ἀποφαίνει δυσὶ καὶ τριάκοντα καὶ τετρακοσίοις ὑστεροῦσαν τῶν Ἰλιακῶν. ὁ δὲ χρόνος οὗτος ἀναμετρηθεὶς ταῖς Ἐρατοσθένους* (who placed the capture of Troy a. 1183) *χρονογραφίαις κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον ἔτος πίπτει τῆς ἑβδόμης ὀλυμπιάδος.* (1183—432=751.)

2. The title of Origines ('original history') is most easily explained by assuming the first three books to have at first been published separately. Of the 7th book, at least, it is certain that it was composed and published after the others; see Cic. Brut. 23, 89: Lusitanis a Ser. Galba praetore (a. 603) . . interfectis T. Libone tribuno pl. (605) populum incitante . . M. Cato legem suadens in Galbam multa dixit; quam orationem in Origines suas rettulit, paucis antequam mortuus est diebus an mensibus. See Cato ap. Cic. Cato mai. (the scene is laid a. 604) 11, 38: septimus mihi liber Originum est in manibus. Gell. XII 25 (24), 15: Cato ex Originum septimo, in oratione quam contra Ser. Galbam dixit. The publication of the first three books might have taken place c. 588, as the antiquity of Ameria was in it fixed by reference to the war with Perseus (Plin. N. H. III 14, 114: Ameriam . . Cato ante Persei bellum conditam annis DCCCCLXIV prodit). But Cato's speech pro Rhodiensibus, contained in the 5th book, was also as early as a. 586 = 168 B. Chr. If therefore the original publication had been extended to 5 books, the title would have been chosen a parte potiori, as the introduction of the oldest history of the rest of Italy was after all peculiar to Cato,

while in the history of Rome he was preceded by Fabius Pictor whom he sometimes merely copied (cf. Dionys. ant. I 79) and the history of the two Punic wars had also been related by that writer. Jordan p. XXIV: qui libros septem ab Aeneae adventu ad Ser. Galbae praeturam pertinentes 'Origines' nominavit satis . . monstravit sese res romanas ab origine repetitas vel ab origine libros VII composuisse. But the works of almost all Annalists had the same dimensions, without the title of Origines ever having been chosen by them.

3. The subject entitles us to call the work Historiae; so Corn. Nep. l. l. and Serv. Aen. VI 842: Cato Censorius qui scripsit historias. Plut. Cato 25: *συνετάττετο λόγους τε παντοδαπούς καὶ ἱστορίας.* He is classed with the Annalists by Cic. de or. II 12, 51: Graeci quoque ipsi sic initio scriptitarunt ut noster Cato, ut Pictor, ut Piso. De leg. I 2, 6: post annales pontificum maximorum . . si aut ad Fabium aut ad . . Catonem aut ad Pisonem aut ad Fannium aut ad Tennonium venias. Plin. N. H. VIII 5, 11 (see above n. 1) calls the origines — annales. The insertion of speeches by the author was no doubt a deviation from the manner of the Annalists, Cato being altogether haud sane detrectator laudum suarum (Liv. XXXIV 15, 9). These speeches seem to have been collected at a later time and thus (very much like those from Sallust's Historiae) to have survived the work of which they originally formed part (comp. Jordan p. LVIII).

4. Collection of the fragments of the Origines by Krause p. 89 sqq., C. L. Roth p. 266—288, H. Jordan p. 3—30, comp. p. XIX—LXI. A. Wagner, . . Orig. fragmenta emendata, disposita, illustrata, Bonn 1849. 68 pp. 8. A. Bormann, . . Originum libri VII. Reliquias disposuit et de instituto operis disputavit. Brandenburg 1858. 48 pp. 4. H. Jordan in Jahn's Jahrb. LXXIX p. 424—433. J. Vahlen, Ztschfr. f. östr. Gymn. 1859 p. 480—489. Also W. Fröhner, Philol. XV p. 350 sq. Schwegler, H. of Rome I p. 81—84. Gerlach, Rom. historians p. 55—58. L. Kieserling de rer. script. p. 23—29.

110. Cato published his practical instructions on agriculture, sanitary rules, and eloquence, perhaps also military art and law, as admonitions to his son. In the first three branches especially many practical sayings attest his quick observation. He also wrote for his son practical rules of life in verse and addressed letters to him. In the same way as he had published a collection of the witty sayings of others, his own were soon collected; in the middle ages, moreover, collections of sentences were circulated under his name.

1. O. Jahn, on Roman Encyclopedias, Trans. of the Saxon Society 1850, p. 263—273. 281. H. Jordan, Cato q. exst. p. XCIX sqq.

2. In respect of the subject-matter, the most appropriate title for Cato's principal didactic work is praecepta ad filium (Non. v. mediast.,

p. 143). We also find more general citations, e. g. ad filium, libri quos scripsit ad filium (Serv. Georg. II 95) or special designations either from the form (oratio, epistula) or the subject (de agricultura, de oratore). The extent of the whole work is doubtful. Though Cato was omnium bonarum artium magister (Plin. N. H. XXXV 2, 2, comp. XIV 4, 44: insignis .. claritate litterarum praeceptisque omnium rerum expetendarum datis generi romano) and Cic. might justly say of him (de or. III 33, 135): nihil in hac civitate temporibus illis sciri discive potuit quod ille non cum investigarit et scierit tum etiam conscripserit, it may still be questioned whether all this heap of information was contained in one and the same work. The libri ad filium must have contained precepts on agriculture; see Jordan p. 78 sq. CI sq.; in the same way his warnings against Greek quacks (above 45, 1) and several sanitary rules must have been addressed to his son (O. Jahn p. 265—268. Jordan p. 77 sq.); no less his rules for an orator (Jordan p. 80), on account of which Quintil. III 1, 19 declares him to be the first Roman qui condidit aliqua in hac materia. It is quite probable that his instruction extended also to military art, and consequently the liber de re militari (Jordan p. 80—82, comp. p. CII sq.) formed part of the praecepta ad filium (Jahn p. 270 sq.), though it is not borne out by the fragments, in which neither an address nor any attention to the capacity of a learner is conspicuous. See Köchly and Rüstow, Greek military Writers II (1855) p. 61—65. This applies even more to Cato's juridical writings, which there is no doubt that he composed (Cic. de or. III 33, 135: num quia ius civile didicerat causas non dicebat? aut quia poterat dicere iuris scientiam neglegebat? utroque in genere et elaboravit et praestitit. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 38: deinde — after the Aelii — M. Cato, princeps Porciae familiae, cuius et libri exstant, sed plurimi Marci filii eius, ex quibus ceteri oriuntur: Mommsen ordiuntur. But as his son became more famous in that field, the citation in Festus p. 157 M. (Cato in commentariis iuris civilis) as well as Cic. de or. II 33, 142 should be rather explained of him, see 114, 6. The quotations undoubtedly belonging to the praecepta, tend to show them as a kind of Vademecum for a young Roman, though with a peculiar colouring from the author's natural energy; they attest his wonderful talent of hitting the mark (e. g. rem tene, verba sequentur), and are composed in a categorical style, almost like oracles.

2. Both the expressions liber and carmen render it improbable that the liber Catonis qui inscriptus est carmen de moribus (Gell. XI 2, 2, comp. Non. p. 465) formed part of the praecepta. If it was in metre (see above 51, 2), it was no doubt in Saturnian verses (Ritschl, Vahlen, Jordan); which is, however, not strongly enough borne out by the scanty fragments (Jordan p. 82 sq.). See Ritschl, poes. Saturn. spicileg. I. Bonn 1854. 4. p. 7 sqq. J. Vahlen, Ztschfr. f. östr. Gymn. 1859, p. 469—477. H. Jordan p. CIII sq. E. Kärcher (Phil. VIII 727—731, comp. IX 412—425) and A. Böckh (Monatsber. der Berl. Akad. May 1854 p. 264—282) are in favour of trochaic septenarii, A. Fleckeisen (Catonianae poesis reliquiae, Lips. 1854) of sotadean metre.

4. Cato's letters to his son are mentioned by Cic. de off. I 11, 10 and Plutarch Cato mai. 20., Quaest. rom. 39, but the quotations do not show that they were part of the praecepta. It is uncertain whether Cato published letters addressed to others. Jordan p. 83 sq. cf. p. CIV sq.

5. Cic. off. I 29, 104: multa multorum facete dicta, ut ea quae a sene Catone collecta sunt, quae vocant Ἀποφθέγματα. Plut. Cato mai. 2 extr.: μεθηρμηνευμένα (from the Greek) πολλὰ κατὰ λέξιν ἐν τοῖς Ἀποφθέγμασι καὶ ταῖς γνωμολογίαις (witty sayings and sentences, perhaps two different kinds) τέταχται. See Jordan p. CVI and 83, Rh. Mus. XIV p. 261—283, and in Jahn's Jahrb. 73 p. 384—391.

6. Cato's own dicta seem to have been collected after his death, from personal recollection as well as from his writings. Cicero and Cornelius Nepos allude to them; most have, however, been preserved by Plutarch; see the collection in Jordan p. 97—111, comp. p. CVI sq. At a much later time, nice discriminations of synonymous expressions were excerpted from his writings by grammarians, a proceeding which led to the mistake that he himself had written about Synonyms (differentiarum liber): Jordan p. CVII sq. The medieval collections of sentences contained, though from suspected sources, also sentences of Cato; but the title Catonis (or Catonis alterius, the New Cato's) sententiae denotes them only as wise sayings, the epithet 'alter' being perhaps intended to designote the author of the distichs de moribus, Dionysius Cato or Ethicus. H. Jordan p. CVIII and Rh. Mus. XIV p. 277—280.

111. Of all Cato's writings only his work de re rustica has been preserved entire. It is a manual of agriculture specially intended for a certain estate (of L. Manlius) near Casinum and Venafrum. The first systematic part is followed, in a somewhat discursive manner, by a large number of receipts, rules for housekeeping, formulas for sales and leases, sacrifices and cures by sympathy. The whole tone is in keeping with Cato's abrupt manner; short sentences thrown out like aphorisms, but of great precision, succeed one another. The style is not very archaic, whence we may suspect that the book in its present form is only a later revision, occasioned both by the subject and the absence of any obvious order.

1. The text is found in the Collections of the scriptores rei rusticae; see above 44; 2. A separate edition, cura Haynisch, Schleiz 1743. Translated (into German) by C. Gross (Halle 1787), Ganter (Donaueschingen 1844). Its preservation in its original form (assuming its gradual composition from accidental notes for private use) is maintained by R. Klotz, on the original form of Cato's work de r. r., in Jahn's Jahrb. Suppl. X (1844), p. 5 sqq., comp. also his History of the Latin

literature I p. 22—24; a later version is assumed by H. Keil, observationes criticae in Catonis et Varronis de r. r. libros (Halle 1849. 101 pp. 8.), esp. p. 65—76. For the criticism of the text see H. Usener, Rh. Mus. XIX p. 141—144.

2. That the work was intended for one certain estate, has been proved by K. W. Nitzsch, on Cato's work on agriculture, Ztschr. f. d. AW. 1845 no. 62—64, p. 493—511. Hence may be explained the special attention paid to the cultivation of vine (Casinum) and olives (Venafrum), while there is little said about corn, those fields in the estate of L. Manlius having been leased out. Varro (R. R. I 2, 28) expresses himself inaccurately: in magni illius Catonis libro qui de agri cultura est editus. But in Cic. Cato m. 15, 54: in eo libro quem de rebus rusticis scripsi. Part of the estate, viz. that intended for winter-grazing, consisted of ager publicus. Ch. 135 contains even the addresses of work people in Casinum and Venafrum. On the plants occurring in the work see E. Meyer, History of Botany I p. 341—347.

3. Ch. 143 is eminently characteristic of the spirit and tone of the whole; it treats of the vilica, e. g. ea te metuat. facito ne nimium luxuriosa siet. vicinas aliasque mulieres quam minimum utatur, neve domum neve ad sese recipiat. ad cenam ne quo eat neve ambulatrix siet. rem divinam ni faciat ... scito dominum pro tota familia rem divinam facere. munda siet. villam conversam mundamque habeat etc.

112. Of the contemporaries of Cato we know as orators Q. Fabius Maximus (Cunctator), Q. Caecilius Metellus, M. Cornelius Cethegus, P. Licinius Crassus (Dives), Africanus the Elder, the father of the two Gracchi, as well as L. Papirius and L. Paulus.

1. Q. Fabius Q. f. Q. n. Maximus Verrucosus, Cons. 521, 526, 539, 540, 545; Censor 524; Dictator 537; see A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. VI 2 p. 2901—2911. Cic. Cato m. 4, 12: multa in eo viro praeclara cognovi, sed nihil est admirabilius quam quo modo ille mortem filii tulit, clari viri et consularis. est in manibus laudatio; quam cum legimus, quem philosophum non contemnimus? Plut. Fab. 1: *διασώζεται αὐτοῦ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν ἐν τῷ δήμῳ, τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ μεθ' ὑπατείαν ἀποθανόντος ἐγκώμιον.* ib. 25: *τὸ δ' ἐγκώμιον . . αὐτὸς εἶπε καταστὰς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καὶ γράψας τὸν λόγον ἐξέδωκεν.* Whether the quotation 'Fabius Maximus: amitti quam apisci' ap. Priscian VIII p. 380, 16 sq. H., belongs to it, is not certain: see Hertz's note. His son (Cons. 541) died probably not before a. 548; see Haakh l. l. p. 2911, n. 32.

2. Q. Metellus, Cons. 548; see Haakh l. l. II p. 23 n. 3. Plin. N. H. VII 43: Q. Metellus in ea oratione quam habuit supremis laudibus patris sui L. Metelli, (Cons. 503. Dictator 530) ... scriptum reliquit etc. Comp. Cic. Brut. 14, 57.

3. M. Cornelius Cethegus, Cons. 550, died 558; see C. Krafft in Pauly's Encycl. II p. 686, n. 1. As an orator he was praised by Q. Ennius, see Cic. Brut. 15, 57—56. Cato m. 14, 50. Enn. ed. Vahlen p. 45 sq. IV sq.

4. P. Licinius Crassus Dives, Cons. 549, † 571; see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1054 sq. n. 10. Liv. XXX 1, 5: facundissimus habebatur seu causa oranda seu in senatu, ad populum suadendi ac dissuadendi locus esset; iuris pontificii peritissimus. Comp. Cic. de or. III 33, 134. Cato mai. 20, 50 (et pontificii et civilis iuris studium).

5. Africanus the Elder (Cons. 549 and 560), † c. 570: see C. Krafft l. l. II p. 654—661. Cic. Brut. 19, 77: ipsum Scipionem accepimus non infantem fuisse. Liv. XXXIX 52, 3: tribunus pl. M. Naevius (a. 567 or 569), adversus quem oratio inscripta P. Africani est. Cf. XXXVIII 56. Gell. IV 18, 6: fertur etiam oratio quae videtur habita eo die a Scipione; et qui dicunt eam non veram etc. Cicero did not accept it as genuine; see Off. III 1, 4: nulla eius ingenii monumenta mandata litteris; and no doubt is was of an apocryphal character, see Nissen, Critical Investig. p. 51. On his son see 116, 3; on his son-in-law Nasica 116, 4. Laelius the Elder, the friend of Africanus, is also praised as a political orator, by Sil. It. XV 453—458.

6. Ti. Sempronius P. f. Ti. n. Gracchus, Cons. 577 and 591, Censor 585; see A. Haakh l. l. VI 1 p. 978—981. Cic. Brut. 20, 79: erat isdem temporibus Ti. Gracchus . . cuius exstat oratio graeca apud Rhodios (a. 589 or 593). quem civem cum gravem tum etiam eloquentem constat fuisse. To him also was attributed an apocryphal speech in defence of his father-in-law, Africanus the Elder; see Liv. XXXVIII 56, 2 sqq. In the mss. of Cornelius Nepos two large fragments of a letter of his wife Cornelia to her son Gaius belonging to a. 630 are preserved, nor is there any doubt that there were letters by her current in antiquity (Cic. Brut. 58, 211: legimus epistulas Corneliae, matris Gracchorum; apparet filios non tam in gremio educatos quam in sermone matris. Cf. Quintil. I 1, 6), but the authenticity of the fragments handed down to us has been doubted (A. G. Lange, Miscellaneous Writings p. 108 sqq. Sörgel, Corneliae . . epistolarum fragmenta genuina esse non posse, in W. Bauer and G. Friedlein, Journal for Bavarian Schools, III 4. 1866), though as it seems without sufficient reason. A rhetor would have made the mother of the Gracchi rather declaim for liberty and for revenge against the murderers of her son's brother (see above 37, 4); but he would never have succeeded in combining the manly energy of thought of an old Roman with a woman's tenderness and carelessness of style. See also L. Mercklin, de Corneliae vita, moribus, epistolis, Dorpat 1845.

7. Cic. Brut. 46, 170: apud maiores nostros video disertissimum habitum ex Latio L. Papirium Fregellanum, Ti. Gracchi P. f. fere aetate; eius etiam oratio est pro Fregellanis coloniisque latinis habita in senatu.

8. L. Aemilius L. f. M. n. Paulus, Cons. 572 and 586, † 594; see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. I 1 p. 368—370. Cic. Brut. 20, 80: etiam L. Paulus, Africani pater, personam principis civis facile dicendo tuebatur. Cf. Liv. XLV 8. Val. Max. V 10, 2: quem casum (the death of his sons) quo robore animi sustinuerit oratione quam de rebus a se gestis apud populum habuit hanc adiciendo clausulam nulli ambiguum reliquit. Cf. Liv. XLV 41. Plut. Aem. P. 36.

113. Among Cato's younger contemporaries who were orators in the 6th century V. C. we must specially mention C. Sulpicius Gallus and C. Titius, the one on account of his accurate learning, the other because he also wrote tragedies.

1. C. Sulpicius C. f. C. n. Gallus, Cons. 588, † 604 (see Cic. Brut. 23, 90); cf. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 1493 sq. n. 29. Cic. Brut. 20, 78: de minoribus C. Sulpicius Gallus maxime omnium nobilium graecis litteris studuit, isque et oratorum in numero est habitus et fuit reliquis rebus ornatus atque elegans. Off. I 6, 19: videbamus in studio dimetiendi paene caeli atque terrae C. Gallum .. quam delectabat eum defectiones solis et lunae multo ante nobis praedicere! His reported prediction of an eclipse of the moon in the night preceding the battle of Pydna (from 21 to 22 June 586 V. C. = 168 B. C. according to the proleptical Julian calendar) has been reduced by Th. H. Martin, Revue archéol. 1864. I. p. 192 sqq. to a posterior explanation of the phenomenon on the following day. Pliny in the Ind. auct. of book II quotes him as a writer on astronomy, comp. N. H. II 19, 21: in qua sententia (that of Pythagoras touching the mutual distances of the constellations) et Gallus Sulpicius noster fuit. Cf. ib. c. 9: ab imperatore productus ad praedicendam eclipsim, mox et composito volumine.

2. Macrob. II 12 = III 16, 14: C. Titius, vir aetatis Lucilianae, in oratione qua legem Fanniam (a. 593) suasit. Cic. Brut. 45, 167: eiusdem (as M. Antony and L. Crassus) fere temporis fuit eques rom. C. Titius, qui meo iudicio eo pervenisse videtur quo potuit fere latinus orator sine graecis litteris et sine multo usu pervenire. huius orationes tantum argutiarum, tantum exemplorum, tantum urbanitatis habent ut paene attico stilo scriptae esse videantur. easdem argutias in tragoedias satis quidem ille acute, sed parum tragice transtulit. If the lex Fannia be the one of a. 593 (and we do not know of another), the definitions of the time of Titius' life given above must be inaccurate as well as the enumeration in Fronto Epist. I 7 p. 20, 6 Naber: contigisse quid tale M. Porcio aut Q. Ennio aut C. Graccho aut Titio poetae? That date is, in all probability, due to a confusion with C. Titius of a. 665 (cf. Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 2009, n. 4). As it is, it is in both cases somewhat vague, and Cicero's words are improbable for other reasons also. A writer of tragedies cannot have been without all knowledge of Greek literature, though he may have been unacquainted with the Greek orators; and the extensive fragment of a speech of Titius shows less

of argutiae, urbanity and Attic style than of telling energy and a graphic description of details. At all events, Titius must have been young a. 593. — Haym, de C. Titio, Lauban 1832. 4. Mommsen, H. of R. II² p. 403 sq. comp. 455.

114. The most remarkable jurists of the 6th century V. C. are the two Aelii, Publius and especially his younger brother Sextus, the first writer of a juridical work. It was entitled Tripertita, and treated of the 12 tables, their explanation, and of the formula of law-suits. Besides these, we have Scipio Nasica, L. Atilius (or Acilius), Q. Fabius Labeo and Cato's son.

1. P. Aelius Q. f. P. n. Paetus, Cons. 553, Censor 555, † 580. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. I 1 p. 332, n. 5. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 38: deinde (after Ti. Coruncanius) Sex. Aelius et frater eius, P. Aelius, et P. Atilius maximam scientiam in profitendo habuerunt, ut duo Aelii etiam consules fuerint. Atilius autem primus a populo Sapiens appellatus est.

2. Sex. Aelius Paetus Catus, Cons. 556, Censor 560. W. Teuffel l. l. p. 332 sq. n. 6. Cic. de or. I 48, 212: sin quaereretur quisnam iuris consultus vere nominaretur, eum dicerem qui legum et consuetudinis eius qua privati in civitate uterentur et ad respondendum et ad agendum et ad cavendum peritus esset; et ex eo genere Sex. Aelium, M'. Manilium, P. Mucium nominarem. Brut. 20, 78: Sex. Aelius, iuris quidem civilis omnium peritissimus, sed etiam ad dicendum paratus. Cato mai. 9, 27: nihil Sex. Aelius tale (on old age), nihil multi annis ante Ti. Coruncanius, nihil modo P. Crassus (see 112, 4), a quibus iura civibus praescribebantur, quorum usque ad extremum spiritum est provecta prudentia. Pompon. l. l.: Sex. Aelium etiam Ennius laudavit et exstat illius liber qui inscribitur Tripertita, qui liber veluti cunabula iuris continet. Tripertita autem dicitur quoniam lege XII tabularum praeposita iungitur interpretatio (cf. R. Schöll, Legis XII tabb. reliqq. p. 22—25) deinde subtexitur legis actio. eiusdem esse tres alii libri referuntur, quos tamen quidam negant eiusdem esse, sed hos sectati ad aliquid Aeli Cati (according to Huschke's emendation). Cf. ib. 7: augescente civitate, quia deerant quaedam genera agendi, non post multum temporis spatium (after Cn. Flavius) Sex. Aelius alias actiones composuit et librum populo dedit, qui appellatur (in later time) ius Aelianum. Cf. Mommsen H. of R. I³ p. 913.

3. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 37: fuit maximae scientiae (as a jurist) .. Gaius (?) Scipio Nasica, qui Optimus a senatu appellatus est (a. 550; Cons. 561), cui etiam publice domus in sacra via data est, quo facilius consuli posset.

4. L. Atilius is mentioned by Pomponius, see n. 1. But Cic. Lael. 2, 6: scimus L. Acilium apud patres nostros appellatum esse Sapientem ... quia prudens esse in iure civili putabatur. Leg. II 23, 59: hoc (lessum in

the XII tables) veteres interpretes Sex. Aelius, L. Acilius non satis se intellegere dixerunt.

5. Q. Fabius Labeo, Cons. 571; see A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 2912 sq. n. 37. Cic. Brut. 21, 81: Ser. Fabius Pictor et iuris et litterarum et antiquitatis bene peritus; Quintusque Fabius Labeo fuit ornatus eisdem fere laudibus. Suet. vita Terent. 4 (p. 31 sqq. R.): Santra Terentium putat . . uti potuisse . . Q. Fabio Labeone et M. Popillio, consulari utroque ac poeta. See above 97, 5. 103, 4.

6. M. Porcius Cato (Licinianus), born c. 562, † 602; see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 1910 n. 11. Pomponius' words see above 110, 2. Gell. XIII 20 (19), 9: ex maiore Catonis filio, qui praetor designatus patre vivo mortuus est et egregios de iuris disciplina libros reliquit. Inst. I 11, 12: apud Catonem bene scriptum refert antiquitas. etc. Ulp. Dig. XXI 1, 10, 1: Catonem scribere lego etc. Paul. ib. XXIV 3, 44 pr.: Nerva et Cato responderunt, ut est relatum etc. XLV 1, 4, 1: Cato libro XV° scribit etc. He is principally known by the regula Catoniana, that legacies should be considered valid according to the condition of the testator at the time of making his will; see tit. Dig. XXXIV 7 and Majansius ad Ict. fragm. I p. 83—110. E. L. Harnier, de regula Catoniana, Heidelberg 1820.

115. One of the aristocratic adversaries of Cato, M. Fulvius Nobilior, composed and published fasti. His son Quintus, too, showed interest in literature.

1. The father was Cons. 565 (in Aetolia), Censor 575. Macrob. Sat. I 12, 16: Fulvius Nobilior in fastis quos in aede Herculis Musarum (founded from the Aetolian booty, cf. Plin. N. H. XXXV 10, 66) posuit Romulum dicit . . Iunium mensem vocasse. Comp. ib. 13, 21: Fulvius id egisse M'. Acilium cos. dicit a. u. c. a. DLXII, inito mox bello aetolico. Varro L. L. VI 33: ut Fulvius scribit et Junius (on the name Aprilis). Censorin. d. n. 20, 2: magis Iunio Gracchano et Fulvio et Varroni et Suetonio aliisque credendum. ib. 4: sive a Numa, ut ait Fulvius, sive, ut Iunius, a Tarquinio. 22, 9: Fulvius et Iunius auctores sunt (on the Roman names of the months). Charis. I p. 112 P. = p. 138, 15 sq.: Nobiliore, comparativa Plinius e putat ablativo finiri; antiquos tamen ait per i locutos, quippe fastos omnes et libro 'a Fulvio Nobiliori' scriptum rettulisse. See above 64, 2 and on his relations with Ennius n. 2 and above 89, 2. 4. 5.

2. Cic. Brut. 20, 79: Q. Nobiliorem M. f. iam patrio instituto deditum studio litterarum, qui etiam Q. Ennium, qui cum patre eius in Aetolia militaverat, (see above 89, 4) civitate donavit cum triumvir coloniam deduxisset (a. 570, when coloniae duae, Potentiam in Picenum, Pisaurum in gallicum agrum deductae sunt, Liv. XXXIX 44, 10; cf. above 89, 5). Liv. XLIX: Q. Fulvius Nobilior ei (i. e. Cato) saepe ab eo in senatu laceratus respondit pro Galba (a. 605, at the same accusation of the Lusitanians). Quintus was Consul a. 601, and Censor probably 618.

116. C. Acilius, A. Postumius Albinus and the son of Africanus the Elder were historians in Cato's time, but all wrote in Greek. Africanus the Elder himself and Scipio Nasica furnished contributions to history.

1. Cic. off. III 32, 115: Acilius autem, qui graece scripsit historiam, plures ait fuisse qui in castra revertissent (after the battle of Cannae). His work contained, in the introduction, the foundation of Rome; see Plut. Rom. 21 (*Γάιος Ἀχίλιος ἱστορεῖ, πρὸ τῆς κτίσεως* etc.). Dionys. Ant. III 67 (*Γάιον Ἀχίλλιον ποιησάμενος . . βεβαιωτήν*). Strab. V 3, 3. p. 230 (if indeed we may there follow Schwegler, H. of R. I p. 80 n. 1, in emending the ms. reading *ὅγε Κύλιος* or *ὁ κεκύλιος* to *Ἀκύλιος*). A. continued his history until at least a. 560 (Liv. XXXV 14, 5), perhaps even until his own time, if indeed he be the same as the senator C. Acilius who, as Gell. VI (VII) 14, 9 relates (comp. also Plut. Cat. mai. 22), served as interpreter of a Greek embassy in the senate a. 599, and if (as is very probable) the traditional reading C. Iulius senator graece res romanas scribit (c. 612 V. C.) Liv. LIII should be changed into Acilius senator, with M. Hertz, de Cinc. p. 12. (Rh. Mus. XVII p. 579 sq. n. 9). Later on, the work was put into Latin and no doubt independently brought down to the time of the civil wars (Oros. V 20: Claudius historicus) by Claudius (Quadrigarius) and in that form used by Livy; see Liv. XXV 39, 12: Claudius qui annales Acilianos ex graeco in latinum sermonem vertit. Comp. XXXV 14, 5: Claudius secutus graecos Acilianos libros. Nissen, Crit. Investig. p. 39—41 alleges against the identity of this Claudius with Quadrigarius that Livy always calls him only Claudius, and never by his cognomen, as he does with his other predecessors; while on the other hand Pluess, de Cinc. p. 43—45 in favour of their identity relies on the duel of Manlius Torquatus (Liv. VII 9 sq.), for which Livy VI 42, 5 mentions Claudius as his authority, Gellius, however, IX 13, 4 sqq. expressly alleges Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, quoting also his identical words. In general see Gerlach, Historians p. 53 sq. Kieserling, rer. rom. script. p. 29 sq. A. Preuner in Pauly's Encyclop. I 1 p. 109 sq. n. 4.

2. A. Postumius A. f. Albinus, Cons. 603; cf. A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 1941 n. 33. Polyb. XL 6: *Αὖλος Ποστούμιος . . οἰκίας μὲν ἦν καὶ γένους πρώτου, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἰδίαν φύσιν στωμύλος καὶ λάλος καὶ πέρπερος διαφερόντως. ἐπιθυμήσας δὲ εὐθέως ἐκ παίδων τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἀγωγῆς καὶ διαλέκτου πολὺς μὲν ἦν ἐν τούτοις . , . τέλος δὲ καὶ ποίημα γράψειν καὶ πραγματικὴν ἱστορίαν ἐπεχείρησεν.* Cic. Acad. pr. II 45, 137: A. Albinum . . doctum sane hominem, ut indicat ipsius historia scripta graece. Brut. 21, 81: vivo Catone minores natu multi uno tempore oratores floruerunt. nam A. Albinus, is qui graece scripsit historiam, . . et litteratus et disertus fuit. Gell. XI 8, 2 sqq. (verbally copied by Macrob. praef. 14 sqq.): Albinus . . res romanas oratione graeca scriptitavit. From Macrob. (II 16 =) III 20, 5: Postumius Albinus Annali primo de Bruto: ea causa sese stultum brutumque faciebat

one feels tempted to assume the existence of a Latin version of the work; but the translation of those words might just as well be due to Macrobius' authority as the one in praef. 14 sqq. belongs to Cornelius Nepos (Gell. XI 8, 5). At all events it seems that Post. also somehow or other took in the earliest history. Serv. Ae. IX 710: Postumius De adventu Aeneae et Lutatius Communium historiarum Boiam . . dicunt is rendered suspicious by its agreement with the supposititious Vict. de orig. g. rom. 15, 4 and requires further explanation.

3. Cic. Brut. 19, 77: filius eius (of Africanus the Elder), . . si corpore valuisset, in primis habitus esset disertus; indicant cum oratiunculae tum historia quaedam graeca, scripta dulcissime. Cato mai. 11, 35: ad paternam magnitudinem animi doctrina uberior accesserat. Vellei. I 10, 3: P. Scipioni, P. Africani filio, nihil ex paterna maiestate praeter speciem nominis vigoremque eloquentiae retinenti. He became augur a. 574 (Liv. XL 42, 13). His epitaph in Saturnian metre C. I. lat. I 33 (p. 19).

4. Plut. Aemil. Paul. 15: *ὁ Νασικᾶς ἐπικαλούμενος Σκηπίων* (Cons. 592 and 599, Censor 595; see C. Krafft in Pauly's Encyclop. II p. 667 n. 12) . . *γεγραφὼς περὶ τῶν πράξεων τούτων* (in the war with Perseus) *ἐπιστόλιον πρός τινα τῶν βασιλέων*. Comp. ib. 16. Cic. Brut. 20, 79: P. etiam Scipionem Nasicam . . habitum eloquentem aiunt. Cf. Cato m. 20, 50. On the similar work of Africanus the Elder see above 46, 1.

117. The freedman Sp. Carvilius is a remarkable figure in the literary history of the 6th century V. C., one of the first who opened a public school at Rome and the arranger of the Roman alphabet of 21 letters.

1. Plut. Quaest. rom. 59, p. 278 D: *πρῶτος ἀνέῳξε γραμματοδιδασκαλεῖον Σπόριος Καρβίλιος, ἀπελεύθερος Καρβιλίου τοῦ πρώτου γαμετὴν ἐκβαλόντος*. The authorities fluctuate between 519 and 524 as to the time of this first (arbitrary) divorce; see Ritschl Par. p. 68—70. W. Rein in Pauly's Encyclop. II p. 1188. On Carvilius' alphabet see above p. 110.

118. Among the prose-Inscriptions of the sixth-century the SC. de Bacanalibus is the most prominent, both in language and in its subject-matter. It may, however, be stated that the number of these documents is but small, and that their significance, whatever it may be, must be referred either to political history or to the history of the alphabet.

1. The SC. de Bacanalibus of a. 568 is facsimilated by Ritschl in P. L. M. E. XVIII, explained by Mommsen C. I. lat. I 196, p. 43 sq.

2. Among the epitaphs of the Scipios n. 35 (p. 20) in Mommsen, on L. Cornelius Scipio, Quaestor 587, † c. 593, and perhaps n. 36 (c. 600?)

on Scipio Asiagenus belong to this period. Among the elogia, those on L. Paullus (C. I. lat. I p. 278, I, cf. p. 288, XXX), on P. Claudius Pulcher (ib. p. 279, IX), Africanus the Elder (p. 280, XIV), Q. Fabius Maximus (p. 288, XXIX) and on the father of the Gracchi (p. 289, XXXI) belong to the 6th century.

3. The other inscriptions of the 6th century which it is possible to date (from the beginning of the second Punic war) see in Mommsen, C. I. lat. I 530—539, p. 145—148.

B. THE SEVENTH CENTURY V. C.

I. Poets.

119. L. Attius, born a. 584 V. C., † c. 650, is especially famous as the author of tragedies imitated from the Greek. The choice made by Attius manifests a just appreciation of the genuine tragic element, as well as a certain predilection for romantic incidents and the Trojan legends. These fragments are in a lively and impassioned tone, though frequently more cleverly turned than really pathetic. He dealt also with original Roman subjects in his praetextae Aeneadae s. Decius and Brutus. In prose he composed nine books Didascalicon, Pragmaticon libri, Parerga and Annales. Resembling Ennius in versatility of form and subject, liberal thought and consciousness of his own worth, Attius surpassed his predecessor in accuracy and polish.

1. The equally well-attested forms Attius and Accius may be owing to a dialectical difference. In the Imperial period, the form with *tt* gained the ascendancy, and the Greeks always wrote Ἄττιος.

2. Jerome on Euseb. chr. ol. 160, 2 = 138 b. Chr. = 616 V. C.: L. Accius tragoediarum scriptor clarus habetur, natus Mancino et Serrano coss. parentibus libertinis et seni iam Pacuvio Tarenti sua scripta recitavit. a quo et fundus Accianus iuxta Pisaurum dicitur, quia illuc inter colonos fuerat (his father, as the deductio happened as early as 570) ex urbe deductus. His father's patron was perhaps an ancestor of the knight T. Attius (Accius) of Pisaurum in the time of Cicero. Accii (and Attii) appear on Inscriptions from Pisaurum, Olivieri marm. Pisaur. 1738.

3. Cic. Brut. 64, 229: Accius isdem aedilibus (c. 614) ait se et Pacuvium docuisse fabulam, cum ille LXXX, ipse XXX annos natus esset. p. Arch. 11, 27: D. Brutus, summus vir et imperator (cons. 616), Accii amicissimi sui carminibus templorum ac monumentorum aditus exornavit suorum, on which the Schol. Bob. p. 359 observes eius versus Saturnii a D. Bruto Gallaeco vestibulo templi Martis superscripti. —

Cornif. ad Her. I 14, 24 mimus quidam nominatim Accium poetam compellavit in scena. cum eo Accius iniuriarum egit. hic nihil aliud defendit nisi licere nominari eum cuius nomine scripta dentur agenda. Comp. ibid. II 13, 19 P. Mucius (iudex) eum qui L. Accium poetam nominaverat condemnavit. — Plin. N. H. XXXIV 10 notatum ab auctoribus est L. Accium poetam in Camenarum aede maxima forma statuam sibi posuisse, cum brevis admodum fuisset. — Cic. Brut. 28, 107: D. Brutus M. filius, ut ex familiari eius (comp. Leg. II 21, 54) L. Accio poeta sum audire solitus etc. — Val. Max. III 7, 11: poeta Accius . . Iulio Caesari, amplissimo ac florentissimo viro (himself the author of tragedies, aedilis a. 664, died a. 667) in conlegium poetarum venienti numquam adsurrexit, . . quod in comparatione communium studiorum aliquanto se superiorem esse confideret. Besides this, Attius was about 40 years older than that fellow-poet. — Attius died sexagesimo anno (a round number) before the repetition of his Tereus a. V. C. 710, Cic. Phil. I 15, 36, comp. ad Att. XVI 2, 3 and 5 in.

4. Quintil. V 13, 43: aiunt Attium interrogatum, cur causas non ageret, cum apud eum in tragoediis tanta vis esset optime respondendi, hanc reddidisse rationem: quod illic ea diceret quae ipse vellet, in foro dicturi adversarii essent quae minime vellet. In Cic. p. Plancio 24, 59 he is called gravis et ingeniosus poeta, Sest. 56, 120 summus poeta. The epithets altus (Hor. Ep. II 1, 56), animosi oris (Ovid. Am. I 15, 19) etc. express his tragic qualities in a general manner. Comp. Gell. XIII 2, 2 cum Pacuvius . . Tarentum concessisset, Accius, tunc haud parvo iunior, proficiscens in Asiam cum in oppidum venisset, devertit ad Pacuvium comiterque invitatus plusculisque ab eo diebus retentus tragoediam suam cui Atreus nomen est desideranti legit. (3) Tum Pacuvium dixisse aiunt, sonora quidem esse quae scripsisset et grandia, sed videri tamen ea sibi duriora paulum et acerbiora. (4) Ita est, inquit Accius, uti dicis; neque id me sane paenitet; meliora enim fore spero quae deinceps scribam.

5. Of his tragedies we know the titles of at least 37, probably nearly all; the most celebrated were Atreus, Epigoni, Epinausimachia, Philocteta, Telephus. The fragments in Ribb. trag. p. 114—194. Comp. p. 298—346. H. Grotemeyer, de L. Attii tragoediis, Münster 1851. The titles are enumerated and the plots described by W. Teuffel in the Tübingen Progr. 1858 p. 17—28. The Epinausimache and Nyctegresia were perhaps taken not from a Greek tragedy, but the Iliad, and would then have been original as to their form.

6. Of his praetextae (Ribb. trag. p. 237—240, comp. p. 349—351) Decius treated of the death of P. Decius Mus the younger (a. V. C. 459), Brutus of the downfall of Tarquinius Superbus and the creation of consuls.

7. Didascalica, a history of Greek and Roman poetry, with special attention to dramatic art, probably (concluding from analogies) in trochaic tetrameters (G. Hermann; according to Lachmann, Ritschl

and others it was rather in Sotadean metre). Madvig, Opusc. acad. (Copenh. 1834) p. 96 sqq. W. Teuffel, Progr. 1858 p. 35 sq.

8. Pragmaticon libri, (also) in trochaic tetram. and on subjects connected with the history of literature and art.

9. In Nonius p. 61 v. porcae we read a fragment from the Parerga of agricultural contents. Perhaps to this or to the Pragmatica belongs the citation of Accius in Praxidico with an iambic precept as to sowing, ap. Plin. N. H. XVIII 5, 55, cf. Ind. auct. libri XVIII.

10. His Annales were in the epic metre, in at least 3 books, from which mythological quotations (on Hermes and the *Κρόνια*) have been preserved.

11. Very many artificial words in Attius' tragedies, especially his mode of employing alliteration (W. Teuffel Progr. 1858 p. 32 sq.), the notice (in Mar. Vict. p. 2456 P.) that he wrote aggulus (instead of angulus), did not use z and y, and denoted the long quantity of vowels by doubling them, prove that he studied his language; M. Varro, moreover, dedicated to him his work de antiquitate litterarum. Cf. Varro L. L. X 70: Accius haec in tragoediis largius a prisca consuetudine movere coepit et ad formas graecas verborum magis revocare, a quo Valerius (see § 124, 1) ait: Accius Hectorem nolet facere, Hectora malet; and V 21: apud Accium non terminus, sed termen. Hence Detlefsen's conjecture (Rh. Mus. XVIII p. 236—238) is very probable, according to which in Pliny (N. H. VII 39, 128: pretium hominis in servitio geniti maximum ad hanc diem fuit grammaticae artis Daphni, Accio [the mss. have Natio, which probably means L. Atio] Pisaurense vendente et M. Scauro principe civitatis HS DCC licente) the tragic poet is meant, whose instruction imparted such great value to Daphnis.

12. J. Stahlberg, de L. Attii vita et scriptis. Halle 1844. G. Boissier, le poète Attius. Étude sur la tragédie latine pendant la république, Paris 1856. W. Teuffel, Caecilius Statius etc. Tübingen progr. 1858. 4. p. 14—37, and Pauly's Encyclopedia I² p. 2008—2010.

120. T. Quintius Atta was a poet of togatae in the first half of the 7th century; he died A. V. C. 676. The 11 titles known of his plays are all Roman; the scanty fragments abound in archaisms and are lively and bold in style. He was also praised for his consistent delineation of character.

1. Jerome on Euseb. Chr. Ol. 175, 4 = 676 V. C.: T. Quintius (in Schöne's edition Quinticius) Atta scriptor togatarum Romae moritur sepultusque via Praenestina ad miliarium II. — Diomed. III p. 487 P.: Atta togatarum scriptor; p. 488: togatas tabernarias in scenam dataverunt praecipue duo, L. Afranius et C. Quintius.

2. The fragments in Bothe, scen. Lat. V 2 p. 97—102; Neukirch, fab. tog. p. 153—164; Ribb. com. p. 137—140.

3. Varro ap. Charis. II p. 215: ἦθη nullis aliis servare convenit quam Titinio, Terentio, Attae. Fronto Epist. IV 3 p. 62 Naber: animadvertas particulatim elegantiis Novium et Pomponium et id genus in verbis rusticanis et iocularibus ac ridiculariis, Attam in muliebribus.

4. In Hor. Ep. II 1, 79 sqq. Atta serves as an instance of the antiqui whose influence extends to the writer's time and (in his opinion) is injurious to it.

5. Non. Marc. v. crines, p. 202 M.: Atta in Epigrammatibus.

6. Neukirch, de fab. tog. p. 153—164. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. I 2 p. 2040.

121. L. Afranius was, both in fertility and artistic value, the principal poet of togatae; he was born a. V. C. 600 or 610. Of his plays we know pretty well all the titles, the Roman public keeping up their interest in them for a long time. He treated national subjects, but in Menander's spirit and partly in imitation of him. His plots belonged principally to the middle class and family life. In his style he knew, like Titinius, how to combine Plautus' popular manner with the correctness and elegance of Terence.

1. Cic. Brut. 45, 167: quem (sc. C. Titium) studebat imitari [this seems to have merely the value of a connecting expression] L. Afranius poeta, homo perargutus, in fabulis quidem etiam .. disertus. Vellej. II 9, 3: clara etiam per idem aevi spatium fuere ingenia, in togatis Afrani, in tragoediis Pacuvii atque Attii, usque in graecorum ingeniorum comparationem evecta. Comp. I 17, 1. Quintil. X 1, 100: togatis excellit Afranius; utinam non inquinasset argumenta puerorum foedis amoribus, mores suos fassus. Hence Auson. epigr. 71, 2 sqq.: repperit obscenas veneres vitiosa libido, .. quam toga facundi scenis agitavit Afrani. Plots of this kind, as a rule foreign to the New Comedy, were in harmony with the average morality of Rome at that period, as appears from the poets of the Atellanae. — Macrob. Sat. VI 1, 4: Afranius togatarum scriptor in ea togata quae Compitalia inscribitur non inverecunde respondens arguentibus quod plura sumpsisset a Menandro Fateor, inquit, sumpsi non ab illo modo Sed ut quisque habuit conveniret quod mihi Quodque me non posse melius facere credidi, Etiam a Latino. Cic. fin. I 3, 7: locos quosdam, si videbitur, transferam, ... cum inciderit ut id apte fieri posset, ut ab Homero Ennius, Afranius a Menandro solet. His admiration for Terence (Afran. v. 29 sq.) was in keeping with his whole manner.

2. We know the titles of more than 40 plays; the most famous were Divortium, Emancipatus, Epistula, Fratriae, Privignus, Vopiscus. The fragments in Bothe, scen. V 2 p. 160—200; Neukirch, fab. tog. p. 176—279; Ribb. com. p. 140—187. See also Philol. XXI p. 122. 480. Miguel, Cuestion

filológica: un fragmento de Afranio, Madrid 1864. 60 pp. 8., and Nueva disertacion acerca de un fragm. d. Afr., Madrid 1864. 113 pp. 8.

3. His Simulans was performed a. 696 (Cic. p. Sest. 55, 118), his Incendium under Nero (Suet. Ner. 11). In the Augustan period enthusiasts thought him equal to Menander (Hor. Ep. II 1, 57). Even so late a writer as Apuleius (apol. p. 420): eleganter, ut semper, Afranius hoc scriptum reliquit.

4. Bothe, scen. V 2 p. 156—159. Neukirch, fab. tog. p. 165—175. Mommsen, H. R. II² p. 438. W. Teuffel, Caecilius Statius etc. Tübingen 1858. 4. p. 37—43.

122. C. Lucilius, born c. 606 V. C. in the Latin town of Suessa Aurunca in Campania, of a well-to-do equestrian family, came at an early age into the circle of Africanus the younger. Being a Latin without the ius honorum, but in an independent position, Lucilius put down in his poems (Saturae) his reflections on what he saw or heard, and in them freely criticized the life of his contemporaries in its various sides — political, moral and literary — to a degree never attempted either by a comic poet before or a satirist afterwards. His fragments show a manysided culture, acute thought, moral solidity, good humour and ready wit, but also indifference to style. Lucilius was a highly respectable and amiable representative of the new Roman character. He died A. V. C. 651.

1. Jerome on Euseb. Chr. Ol. 158, 2 = 606 sq. V. C. Lucilius poeta nascitur. Vellej. II 9, 4: celebre et Lucilii nomen fuit, qui sub P. Africano (a. V. C. 620 sq.) Numantino bello eques militaverat. Jerome l. l. on Ol. 169, 2 = 651: C. Lucilius (the mss. have Lucius) satirarum scriptor Neapoli moritur ac publico funere effertur anno aetatis XLVI. A safe trace leading beyond 651 does not exist, as the lex Licinia mentioned by Lucilius (Gell. II 24, 10) belongs at the very latest to a. 650 (see Rein in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 1509) and the designation of Lucilius as senex in Hor. Sat. II 1, 34 proves nothing as to the extent of his life; see Teuffel's note on the place (Leipzig 1857) p. 22 sq. Cicero's dialogue de orat. where the scene is laid a. 663 (see I 16, 71. II 6, 25) supposes the death of Lucilius as having taken place before. See in general Varges, Rh. Mus. 1835 p. 15—68.

2. Juv. I 20: magnus Auruncae alumnus. Auson. Epist. 15, 9: rudes Camenas qui Suessae praevenis. — Hor. S. II 1, 75 calls himself infra Lucili censum, on which Porphyr. constat enim Lucilium fuisse maiorem avunculum Pompeii. etenim avia Pompeii soror Lucilii fuerat. Lucilius possessed at Rome sub Velia the house quae Antiochi regis filio obsidi publice aedificata fuerat (Ascon. p. 13 Or.).

3. On his relations with Africanus the younger (570—625) and Laelius (Cons. 614) see Horace S. II 1, 71—74. In the same place v. 62—68 are not quite accurate, see W. Teuffel's notes p. 28 sq. Other friends of his were (Postumius) Albinus, L. Aelius Stilo and Granius. Enemies or at least such as were attacked by Lucilius: Mucius Scaevola, L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus (Pers. I 115), P. Caecilius Metellus (127, 7; Hor. S. II 1, 67), T. Albucius, Hostilius Tubulus, Papirius Carbo and others. — Cornific. ad Her. II 13, 19: C. Caelius iudex absolvit iniuriarum cum qui Lucilium poetam in scena nominatim laeserat.

4. Cornific. ad Her. IV 12, 18: quo in vitio (in regard to verborum traiectio) est Lucilius assiduus, ut hoc est in priore (Lachmann: primore) libro. (Ps. Acro on Hor. S. II 1, 22 speaks of Horace, not of Lucilius). 30 books being undeniably quoted (only of the 21st we have no fragments), we must assume a twofold division, an older in two large parts or collections, and a later one in 30 books. Comp. van Heusde, Lucil. p. 251 sqq. Lersch, Ztschf. f. AW. 1839 p. 403—408. J. Becker, ibid. 1843 no. 30—33. K. Fr. Hermann, Gött. Gel. Anz. 1843 p. 380—384. Petermann, Jahn's Jahrb. XXXIX p. 161 sqq. and Ztschf. f. AW. 1846 p. 37 sq.

5. The details and modes of division and its authors are not certain. At all events, Lucilius' satires soon became the object of learned annotations. Suet. gramm. 2 says that the studium grammaticae was at Rome originally limited to this, ut carmina parum adhuc divolgata vel defunctorum amicorum, vel si quorum aliorum probassent, diligentius retractarent ac legendo commentandoque etiam ceteris nota facerent; ... ut Laelius Archelaus Vettiusque Philocomus Lucilii satiras familiaris sui, quas legisse se apud Archelaum Pompeius Lenaeus, apud Philocomum Valerius Cato praedicant. And ch. 14: huius (viz. Curtius Nicia's in the time of Cicero) de Lucilio libellos etiam Santra comprobat.

6. Lucilius' satires were varied in form (hexameters being predominant, though there were also many trochaic and iambic metres) as well as in contents. But the ethical and critical tendency by which L. became the principal satirist prevailed. Hence Hor. S. II 1, 62: est Lucilius ausus primus in hunc operis componere carmina morem; 10, 48 he calls him inventor, ib. 66 Graecis intacti carminis auctor. See K. Fr. Hermann, de satirae auctore ex sententia Horatii, Marburg 1841, 4, in opposition to which C. Petermann (Hirschberg progr. 1846 and 1851. 4) vainly tries to explain the passage of Ennius as the imitator of the Greeks. Hor. S. I 4, 6: hinc (from the Old Comedy) omnis pendet Lucilius, is unjust and inaccurate; Lydus' assertion (de mag. I 41: *τὸν Ῥινθῶνα, ὃς ἑξαμέτροις ἔγραψε πρῶτος κωμῳδίαν. ἐξ οὗ πρῶτος λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμὰς Λουκίλιος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος ἡρωικοῖς ἔπεσιν ἐκωμῴδησε*) that Lucilius followed Rhinthon, is plainly due to an error.

7. As to the objects of Lucilius' criticism, it is shown by the fragments that he primores populi arripuit populumque tributim (Hor. S. II 1, 69). Comp. Trebonius ap. Cic. Fam. XII 16: qui magis hoc Lucilio

licuerit adsumere libertatis quam nobis? Apul. apol. 10: C. Lucilium, quamqum sit iambicus, tamen improbarim quod Gentium et Macedonem pueros directis nominibus carmine suo prostituerit. E. Szelinski, de nominibus personarum apud poetas sat. rom. (Königsb. 1862) p. 1—10. But there was also grammatical and literary criticism. Gell. XVII 21, 49: Pacuvius et Pacuvio iam sene Accius clariorque tunc in poematis eorum obtrectandis Lucilius fuit. Hor. S. I 10, 53: nil comis tragici mutat Lucilius Atti? on which Porphyr.: facit autem haec Lucilius cum alias tum vel maxime in tertio libro, meminit et nono et decimo. His criticism was especially against Attius' innovations in the idiom (quare pro facie, pro statura Accius status, ap. Non. p. 226) and orthography, in which he impugned the designation of long vowels by doubling them and accepted only ei for i; Ritschl, Monum. epigr. tria (1852) p. 30 sq. W. Corssen, Philologus XVIII p. 723—726. Quintil. X 1, 94: eruditio in eo (L.) mira et libertas atque inde acerbitas et abundantia salis.

8. His popular tendency. Cic. de or. II 6, 25: C. Lucilius, homo doctus et perurbanus, dicere solebat, neque se ab indoctissimis neque a doctissimis legi velle; .. quo etiam scripsit: Persium non curo legere, .. Laelium Decumum volo. Fin. I 3, 7: nec vero, ut noster Lucilius recusabo quominus omnes mea legant. ' Vtinam esset ille Persius! Scipio vero et Rutilius multo etiam magis. Quorum ille iudicium reformidans Tarentinis ait se et Consentinis et Siculis scribere. Facete is quidem, sicut alia; sed neque tam docti tum erant .. et sunt illius scripta leviora, ut urbanitas summa appareat, doctrina mediocris. Petron. Sat. 4 extr.: schedium Lucilianae humilitatis. Gell. VI (VII) 14, 6: vera et propria .. exempla in latina lingua M. Varro esse dicit .. gracilitatis Lucilium. Comp. Fronto p. 113 sq. and p. 62 Naber.

9. As to his careless style comp. Hor. S. I 4, 9 sqq. 10, 1 sqq. 50 sqq. Horace's assertion (S. I 4, 9 sq.) L. in hora saepe ducentos .. versus dictabat stans pede in uno is confirmed by L. himself, e. g. fr. XI 6 conicere in versus dictum praeconis volebam Grani. His metres especially are very loose and uncouth, and sometimes he avails himself of means quite inadmissible. Comp. Auson. Epist. 5, 36 sqq.: Villa Lucani- mox potieris -aca. Rescisso disces componere nomine versum; Lucili vatis sic imitator eris.

10. The authority enjoyed by Lucilius even in the Augustan period (espec. with the national party) appears from the frequent and serious comparisons drawn by Horace between L. and himself. Even later there were people who Lucilium pro Horatio, Lucretium pro Vergilio legunt (Tac. dial. 23) and those who esteemed energy and originality above all, were quite right in doing so. — Quintil. X 1, 93: satira quidem tota nostra est, in qua primus insignem laudem adeptus Lucilius quosdam ita deditos sibi adhuc habet amatores ut eum non eiusdem modo operis auctoribus sed omnibus poetis praeferre non dubitent. On his ethical influence see Juv. I 165 sqq.

11. The fragments (above 800) collected by Janus Dousa (with notes by Francis Dousa), Lugd. B. and Amsterd. 1661. 4. Patav. 1735. 8 (reprinted by Vulpi), in Havercamps Censorinus (Lugd. B. 1643. 1767), in the Bipont edition of Persius and Juvenal, and in other places. Fragmens revus, traduits etc. par E. F. Corpet, Paris 1845. Edidit, auxit, emendavit Fr. D. Gerlach, Zürich 1846. Lachmann's edition (promised by M. Haupt) has never been published. Contributions to their criticism: E. Klussmann, Philol. XVI p. 166—168. L. Müller, Rh. Mus. XVII p. 195—200. J. Iltgen, Luciliana, Bonn 1865. 31 pp. 8. A. Fürth, Quaestiones Lucilianae, Bonn 1866. 34 pp. 8. On the first book R. Bouterwek, Rh. Mus. XXI p. 339—361. The third book by Varges, Stettin 1836. 4. The ninth by L. F. Schmidt, Berlin 1840. 4.

12. On Lucilius see also Manso in his supplements to Sulzer IV p. 419—442. Patin, cours sur Lucile, Paris 1836. Herm. Schönbeck, Quaestionum Lucilianarum, Part. I. Halle 1841. 8. Petermann, de C. Lucilii vita et carminibus, Bresl. 1852. 8. Dziadeck, sat. rom. imprimis Luciliana ant. Gr. comoediae non dissimilis, Conitz 1842. 4. J. A. C. van Heusde, Studia critica in C. Lucilium, Trai. ad Rh. 1842. 321 pp. 8. Comp. K. Fr. Hermann, Gött. Gel. Anz. 1843, no. 37—40. p. 361—392, to which Heusde replied in Epistola ad C. Fr. H. de Lucilio, Trai. ad Rh. 1844. 52 pp. 8. Petermann in Jahn's Jahrb. XXXIX p. 146—169, and Gerlach ibid. XLIII p. 371—388. F. D. Gerlach, C. Lucilius and the Roman Satura, Basle 1844. 4. p. 11—22 = Historical Studies (Basle 1847) p. 3 sqq. Ch. Labitte, les satires de Luc., Revue d. deux mondes. 1845. III. p. 721—745. Patin, Journal des Savans 1846, Fevr. p. 65—76. May p. 281—296. Ch. Elsperger, comm. de sat. Lucilii, Ansbach 1851. 21 pp. 4. Duykers, Étude sur Luc., Revue de l'instr. publ. en Belgique, 1861, n. 2—4. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1181—1187. Mommsen R. H. II[2] p. 444—448.

123. Epigrams mostly of an erotic character and in imitation of Greek (i. e. Alexandrine) models were written by Pompilius and Valerius Aedituus in the first half of the seventh century, and by Porcius Licinus and Q. Lutatius Catulus (Cons. 625) in its middle, Licinus being besides the author of a poem in trochaic tetrameters on points of the history of literature, and Catulus of an autobiography. The epic poet A. Furius of Antium was a friend of the latter.

1. Papini (rather Pompili) *ἐπιγραμμάτιον* quod in adulescentem fecerat Cascam, Varro L. L. VII 28 (two distichs), comp. Pompilius (M. Hertz's emendation instead of Pomponius) in epigrammate, Priscian III p. 602 P. = p. 90, 2 H. Nonius Marc. p. 88 (according to Lachmann's emendation, Lucret. p. 306): Varro *ὄνος λύρας:* Pacvi discipulus dicor, porro is fuit Enni, Ennius Musarum. Pompilius clueor. Varro L. L. VII 93 quotes a senarius from Pompilius.

2. Gell. N. A. XIX 9, 10: versus cecinit Valeri Aedituï, veteris poetae, item Porcii Licini et Q. Catuli, quibus mundius, venustius, limatius, tersius graecum latinumve nihil quidquam reperiri puto (quite exaggerated). On the first epigram of Val. Aed. (ib. § 11) see H. Usener, Rh. Mus. XIX p. 150 sq. XX p. 147—151. R. Peiper, Ibid. XIX p. 311. Both epigrams stand also in Burmann's (III. 242 sq.) and Meyer's Latin anthologies (Ep. 27 sq.).

3. The epigram of Porcius Licinus stands in Gellius XIX 9, 13. Comp. XVII 21, 45: Porcius Licinus serius poeticam Romae coepisse dicit in his versibus Poénico belló secundo etc. (above p. 104). Eleven trochaic septenarii of his concerning Terence are found in Suetonius' vita Terentii c. 1 sq. (p. 292, 16 sqq. Roth, p. 29, 9 sqq. Rffsch.), most likely drawn by him from Varro's work de poetis; see Ritschl's Parerga p. 244. 622. 637 sq.; in Reiffersch.'s Suetonius p. 489—497. The last four are repeated ib. p. 294, 18 sqq. Roth, p. 33, 7 Rffsch. Comp. also Charis. I p. 103 P. = p. 129 K.: huius fretus, Porcius Licinus.

4. An epigram by Q. Catulus is found in Gellius XIX 9, 14. Another in Cic. deor. nat. I 28, 79. He is for this mentioned by Pliny Ep. V 3, 5. His autobiography he addressed to A. Furius poeta, familiaris suus (Cic. Brut. 35, 132) Macrob. Sat. VI 1, 31—34. 44 quotes hexameters which he maintains were imitated by Virgil; the highest quotation is Furius in undecimo (annali) ib. 34. They are so little archaic that they might as well be by Virgil himself. This does not hold good of the lines quoted by Gell. N. A. XVIII 11, 4. Comp. ib. 2: Furium veterem poetam, and in the ind. capp.: ex carminibus Furi Antiatis. Comp. Weichert, poet. lat. rel. p. 348—353. Another line ap. Schol. Veron. Aen. IX 379; in annalibus belli gallici; hic ut ducebant vastae divortia fossae.

124. The learned Q. Valerius of the Latin town of Sora, perhaps also Terentius Libo, and then Volcatius Sedigitus wrote in prose in the first half of the 7th century. C. Julius Caesar Strabo wrote tragedies about the same time.

1. In Cic. de or. III 11, 43 L. Crassus says: nostri (the real Romans) minus student litteris quam Latini. Yet even the most uneducated native Roman might excel litteratissimum togatorum omnium, Q. Valerium Soranum, lenitate vocis atque ipso oris pressu et sono. — Varro L. L. VII 31: apud Valerium Soranum: vetus adagio est, o P. Scipio (died a. 625). From this he appears to have been a contemporary of L. Attius and it becomes probable that he is the same Valerius of whom Varro L. L. X 70 quotes the line: Accius Hectorem nolet facere, Hectora malet, which O. Müller attributes to V. Aedituus. Two hexameters, of Stoic character (on Jupiter as the one and highest god) ap. Augustin. de civ. dei VII 9 fin. (comp. Mythogr. p. 152 Bode): in hanc sententiam etiam quosdam versus Valerii Sorani exponit idem

Varro in eo libro quem seorsum ab istis de cultu deorum scripsit. Plin. N. H. praef. (extr.) hoc (viz. to add a table of contents to a book) ante me fecit in literis nostris Valerius Soranus, in libris quos ἐποπτίδων inscripsit. It may have been in these that he 'enuntiavit' the secret name of the city of Rome (Plin. N. H. III 5, 9. Solin. 2) or according to Plut. quaest. rom. 58 s. 61, that of her tutelary deity, for which he was soon punished, as Plutarch reports, by a miserable death. He may also be indentical with that Valerius whom Varro L. L. V 65 quotes on account of his derivation of the Plautine word scrupipedae. Comp. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 2342, n. 50. His two sons, Q. and D., are mentioned by Cic. Brut. 46, 169: vicini et familiares mei, non tam in dicendo admirabiles quam docti et graecis litteris et latinis.

2. Donatus' addition to Suetonius' life of Terence: duos Terentios poetas fuisse scribit Metius (Maecius), quorum alter Fregellanus fuerit Terentius Libo, and the other the comic poet.

3. Gell. XV 24, 1: Sedigitus (in the ind. capp. it is Volcatius Sedigitus), in libro quem scripsit de poetis, quid de his sentiat qui comoedias fecerunt et quem ex omnibus praestare ceteris putet ac deinceps quo quemque in loco et honore ponat his versibus suis demonstrat. 13 iambic Senarii follow, in which 10 poets of palliatae are enumerated in a very curious arrangement; see above 15, 3. If in Suet. vit. Ter. p. 294 Roth = p. 33 Rffsch. the order Porcius (Licinus), Afranius, Volcatius, Cicero, Caesar, is chronological, as it is highly probable, Volcatius may be assumed to have flourished after the middle of the 7th century. But P. Nigidius Figulus, Cicero's contemporary, seems to have already inserted those lines into one of his works, as in some mss. of Plautus they are inscribed to Nigidius: Ritschl, Par. p. 65 sq. 240 sq. M. Hertz, de Nig. Fig. p. 47—49. Three other senarii by him on Terence see in Sueton. v. Ter. p. 294, 4 sqq. Roth = p. 32, 10 sqq. Rffsch. and Ritschl's notes p. 517 sq. Hence he appears to have summarily treated of the life and works of the poets in question, giving at the same time a kind of aesthetic criticism on them. He does not, however, appear to have gone beyond the time of the palliata and merely for that reason it is unadvisable to place him so late as the time of Cicero.

4. On L. Julius Caesar Strabo (aedile 664, killed 667) see below, and comp. above 119, 3.

125. After the middle of the 7th century V. C. flourished also the two poets who from a popular farce raised the Atellane play to a species of dramatic literature, viz. L. Pomponius of Bononia and Novius, the first of whom seems to have been the more original and fertile. The fragments of both afford a glance at the great moral corruption among even the lower classes.

1. Jerome on Euseb. chr. Ol. 172, 4 = A. V. C. 665: L. Pomponius Bononiensis, Atellanarum scriptor, clarus habetur. Vellei. II 9, 6: sane non ignoramus eadem aetate (as Valerius Antias and others) fuisse Pomponium, sensibus celebrem, verbis rudem et novitate inventi a se operis commendabilem. Comp. Schober, de loco Vellei, Neisse 1831. 4. Macrob. Sat. VI 9, 4: Pomponius, egregius Attellanarum poeta. Comp. Fronto ad M. Caes. IV 3 p. 95 Mai. = 62 Naber (see above 120, 3). Sen. Controv. VII 18, 9 p. 206, 21 sq. Bu.: auctorem huius viti quod ex captione unius verbi plura significantis nascitur aiebat (Cassius Severus) Pomponium Atellanarum scriptorem fuisse. E. Munk, de L. Pomponio Bononiensi Atellanarum poeta, Glogau 1826. 8., and de fab. At. (Lips. 1840) p. 93 sqq. Th. Ladewig in Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 1876 sq. His fragments in Munk, fab. At. p. 136—164. Ribbeck com. p. 191—215. Dotalis should be added to those enumerated by Ribb., see L. Müller, metr. lat. p. 429.

2. Besides the Oscan figures (Bucco auctoratus, adoptatus; hirnea Pappi, Pappus agricola, praeteritus, sponsa Pappi; Maccus, Macci gemini, Maccus miles, sequester, virgo) we find especially various classes (Rustici, Fullones, Leno, Pictores, Pistor, Praeco, Medicus, Aeditumus, Aruspex, Augur and others), tribes (Campani, Galli Transalpini), political (Petitor, Pappus praeteritus, Praefectus morum) and literary subjects (Philosophia; cf. v. 83. 138. 181); also mythological subjects (Agamemno suppositus, Marsya, perhaps also Atalanta, Sisypho, Ariadne, Vahlen Rh. Mus. XVI p. 473 sq.). Several titles are like those of palliatae (Adelphi, Synephebi, Syri, Dotata). Personal allusions occur v. 15. There are amorous complications of the most funny kind, e. g. disguise as a girl, v. 57 sqq. 67 sq.; Maccus Virgo; Nuptiae; Prostibulum. There are many obscene jokes and other immoral passages; numerous puns and frequent alliterations; proverbial expressions and other characteristics of a popular style. His metres were iambic senarii and septenarii, trochaic septenarii, and also (v. 164 sq.) cretics.

3. Novius, Atellanarum probatissimus scriptor, Macrob. Sat. I 10, 3. His praenomen is unknown; very frequently he is mixed up with Naevius. Novianae Atellaniolae were excerpted by M. Aurelius according to Fronto Ep. II 10, p. 34 Naber. His fragments (43 titles) in Munk, fab. Atell. p. 165, comp. p. 117 sqq. Ribbeck, com. p. 215—230.

4. Subjects: personae oscae (duo Dossenni; Maccus copo, exsul; Mania medica; Pappus praeteritus), classes and trades (Agricola, Bubulcus, Ficitor, Vindemiatores; Bubulcus cerdo, Fullones; Milites, Optio, Hetaera), country-clowns (milites Pometinenses), literary (v. 5. 26. 38. 67. 116, perhaps also a burlesque Phoenissae), mythological parodies (Hercules coactor). The titles Dotata, Gallinaria, Lignaria, Tabellaria, Togularia are in appearance like those of the old palliata, while Paedium is like the new one. Besides these we may notice Mortis et vitae iudicium; Malivoli, Parcus, Surdus.

5. The farcical character and obscene jokes, frequent alliterations

and popular forms and constructions, nay even the metres are common to Novius and Pomponius. A comparative frequency of similes from child-life is peculiar to Novius (v. 41. 62. 65).

126. We possess metrical inscriptions during the 7th century partly in the Saturnian metre, partly in popular hexameters or in other Greek metres, especially the iambic senarius.

1. In Saturnians: the titulus Mummianus of a. 609 (C. I. lat. I 541 p. 150 sq. comp. above 52, 8), the epitaph of Maarcus Caicilius (ib. 1006, p. 218), the inscription of Sora (ib. 1175, p. 240; comp. above 52, 9. 104, 1) and the epitaph of Antistia (ib. 1016, p. 222) seem to be intended as such.

2. In popular hexameters: the titulus Mummianus ap. Mommsen C. I. lat. I 542 p. 151 sq., the sortes Praenestinae (ib. 1438—1454, p. 268—270), the epitaph of Cn. Taracius (ib. 1202, p. 244) and of Protogenes (ib. 1297, p. 253). A dactylic octometer ib. 1480, p. 273. N. 1038 shows likewise dactylic metre. Iambs and hexameters appear in n. 1019; distichs n. 1011 and 1220, and in n. 38 (p. 21) of the epitaphs of the Scipios.

3. Among the inscriptions of the C. I. lat. n. 1007—1010. 1012. 1027. 1059? 1067? 1273. 1306. 1479 are in iambic metre.

II. Prose-writers.

127. The first twenty years of the 7th century (600—620 V. C.) are in the history of Rome taken up with wars, especially the Lusitanian (601—620; Viriathus) and the Numantine (611—621) wars, in the shameful conduct of which the consequences of a. 608 = 146 (Carthage, Corinth) already appear. Literary studies were, therefore, very insignificant during this period. These twenty years produced orators in Africanus the younger, and his brother Fabius Aemilianus, Laelius the younger, Sulpicius Galba, M. Lepidus, Furius Philus, Q. Metellus Macedonicus, and the two Mummii.

1. P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, born 570 (Liv. XLIV 44, 3), Cons. 607 and 620, Censor 612, † 625; comp. C. Krafft in Pauly's Encyclop. II p. 662—666. Cic. Brut. 21, 82: C. Laelius et P. Africanus in primis eloquentes. quorum exstant orationes. Lael. 25, 96: quanta illa (Scipionis) fuit gravitas, quanta in oratione maiestas! .. sed .. est in manibus oratio. Comp. de inv. I 4, 5. de or. I 49, 215. Brut. 74, 258. off. I 32, 116. Scipionis orationculae excerpted by M. Aurelius, according to Fronto Ep. II 10 p. 34 N. Among the fragments of his speeches (Meyer ed. I p. 101—106) there are two somewhat more ex-

tensive, ap. Gell. VI (VII) 11, 9. Macrob. (II 10 =) III 14, 7. Most of them very bitterly criticise the spreading corruption of morals. On his delivery see Cic. de or. I 60, 255: multi oratores fuerunt, ut illum Scipionem audimus et Laelium, qui omnia sermone (conversational manner) conficerent paullo intentiore. — Africanus possessed much general culture. Cic. Tusc. I 3, 5: Galbam, Africanum, Laelium doctos fuisse traditum est. II 26, 62: semper Africanus Socraticum Xenophontem in manibus habebat: especially the *Κύρου παιδεία*, Cic. ad Q. fr. I 1, 8, 23. C. Fannius in Annalibus ascribed to him (Socratic) irony, Cic. Acad. II 5, 15. de or. II 67, 270. Brut. 87, 299. He was a friend of Polybius (Polyb. XXXII 9 sq.) and Panaetius (Cic. Acad. II 2, 5. pro Murena 31, 66. comp. de or. II 37, 154). On his friendship with C. Laelius see e. g. Cic. de or. II 6, 22. Hor. S. II 1, 71 sqq., with Terence see above 97, 5 and youthful Lucilius 122, 1.

2. Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus, the elder (Polyb. XXXII 9 sq. Cic. Lael. 19, 69) brother of Scipio Africanus; Cons. 609; see A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 2914, n. 44. Less talented than his younger brother (Cic. l. l.), he held a less prominent position. He recited the funeral speech on Africanus (the younger), Cic. pro Mur. 36, 75, which had been written by C. Laelius who afterwards also published it under his own name; see Schol. Bob. ad Cic. p. Mil. 7, 2. p. 283 Or.: super Africani laudibus exstat oratio C. Laeli Sapientis, qua usus videtur Q. Fabius Maximus in laudatione mortui Scipionis. Comp. Cic. de or. II 84, 341: Q. Tuberoni Africanum avunculum laudanti scripsit C. Laelius.

3. C. Laelius (Sapiens), C. Laeli f. (see above 112, 5), a little older than his friend Scipio Aemilianus (Cic. de rep. I 12, 18); Cons. 614; see H. Hanna, de C. Laelio Sapiente, Lugd. Bat. 1832. A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 725—727, n. 2. — Cic. Brut. 21, 84: ingeni, litterarum, eloquentiae, sapientiae denique, etsi utrique (Africanus and Laelius) primas, priores tamen lubenter deferunt Laelio. Comp. ib. 82 (above n. 1) and de or. I 60, 255. Brut. 21, 83: plurimum tribuitur ambobus, dicendi tamen laus est in Laelio illustrior. at oratio Laelii de collegiis non melior quam de multis quem voles Scipionis; ... multo tamen vetustior et horridior ille quam Scipio. de or. I 13, 58: Ser. Galbae et .. C. Laelio quos constat dicendi gloria praestitisse. Brut. 24, 94: hanc ob causam (because Laelius limatius dicendi consectabantur genus) videtur Laeli mens spiraro etiam in scriptis (orationibus), Galbae autem vis occidisse. 86, 295: de Laelio, cuius tu oratione negas fieri quidquam posse dulcius, addis etiam nescio quid augustius. nomine nos capis summi viri vitaeque elegantissimae verissimis laudibus. Comp. de rep. VI 2, 2 (Laelii oratio exstat), N. D. III 17, 43 (in illa aureola oratiuncula). We do not know of any accusations by Laelius, but of political speeches, defences and panegyrics (see n. 2). Comp. H. Meyer, orat. fragm. p. 96—100 ed. 1. — Cic. ad Att. VII 3, 10: Terentii fabulae propter elegantiam sermonis putabantur a C. Laelio scribi; comp. above 97, 5. Fin. II 8, 24: Diogenem stoicum adulescens,

post autem Panaetium audierat Laelius. From his philosophical tendencies he was called σοφός (Lucil. ib.) or Sapiens (Brut. 58, 213. off. II 11, 40. III 4, 16). Antipater dedicated his history to him (orat. 69, 230).

4. Ser. Sulpicius Galba, born c. 565 (aetate paulum his — viz. Laelius and Africanus the younger — antecedens he is styled by Cic. Brut. 21, 82), impeached a. 605 on account of an act of low breach of faith committed by him in Lusitania a. 604 as propraetor, and discharged only by an illegal proceeding. In spite of this he was Consul a. 610. See A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 1494 sq. n. 31. Cic. Brut. 21, 82 states that he was the first Roman orator who employed artificial figures (ut egrederetur a proposito ornandi causa, . . ut communibus locis uteretur), perhaps in order to hide his bad cause. He was, moreover, ignarus legum, haesitans in maiorum institutis, rudis in iure civili (Cic. de or. I 10, 40). His delivery was remarkable for great vivacity (in agendo . . vehemens atque incensus, Brut. 22, 88; incitata et gravis et vehemens oratio, ib. 24, 93; lateribus et clamore contendebat, de or. I 60, 255; nihil leniter dixit, or. 30, 106; comp. Brut. 22, 86: atrocior acriorque Laelio; 23, 89: elegantia in Laelio, vis in Galba; de or. III 7, 28: gravitatem Africanus, lenitatem Laelius, asperitatem Galba, profluens quidquam habuit Carbo et canorum) and therefore his speeches made less impression when read (Brut. 24, 93 sq.). His style was also less polished (exiliores orationes sunt et redolentes magis antiquitatem quam aut Laelii aut Scipionis aut etiam ipsius Catonis; itaque evanuerunt, vix iam ut appareant, Brut. 21, 82 comp. Tac. dial. 18).

5. M. Aemilius Lepidus, qui est Porcina dictus (Cic. Brut. 25, 95), Cons. 617; see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. I 1 p. 357, n. 8. Cic. l. l.: isdem temporibus fere quibus Galba, sed paulo minor natu, et summus orator est habitus et fuit, ut apparet ex orationibus, scriptor sane bonus. Comp. ibid. 86, 295. 97, 333. But he too shared Galba's ignorance of the law (de or. I 10, 40). Aemilius Porcina orator, in oratione uti lex Aemilia abrogetur, Priscian. IX p. 474, 20 sq. H.

6. L. Furius Philus (Cons. 618) perbene latine loqui putabatur litteratiusque quam ceteri, Cic. Brut. 28, 108. He was a friend of Africanus the younger, and familiar with learned Greeks (de or. II 37, 154). He is mentioned de leg. agr. II 24, 64 (Catones, Phili, Laelii) among men interested in philosophy or possessing practical wisdom (sapientes).

7. Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus, Cons. 611, Censor 623, † 639; a political adversary of Africanus minor; see A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. II p. 23 sq. n. 6. Cic. Brut. 21, 81: Q. Metellus . . in primis est habitus eloquens . . cuius et aliae sunt orationes et contra Ti. Gracchum exposita est in C. Fanni annalibus. Liv. LIX: Q. Metellus censor censuit ut cogerentur omnes ducere uxores liberorum creandorum causa. exstat oratio eius quam Augustus Caesar . . in senatu recitavit . . ut orationem Q. Metelli de prole augenda.

8. Cic. Brut. 25, 94: fuerunt etiam in oratorum numero mediocrium L. et Sp. Mummii, fratres, quorum exstant amborum orationes; simplex quidem Lucius et antiquus, Spurius autem nihilo ille quidem ornatior, sed tamen astrictior; fuit enim doctus ex disciplina Stoicorum. Lucius was Cons. 608 and destroyed Corinth; see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. V. p. 199—202, n. 3. His younger brother Spurius accompanied him as legate to Achaia and wrote epistolas versiculis facetis ad familiares missas a Corintho (Cic. ad Att. XIII 6, 4). See above § 22. W. Teuffel l. l. p. 202, n. 4.

9. Cic. Brut. 25, 94: multae sunt Sp. (Postumii) Albini (Cons. 606) orationes. — Others see 128, 2. 4. 129, 4 and 5.

128. The historians of the first twenty years of the 7th century V. C. still clung to the manner of the older annalists, but followed Cato's example in writing in Latin. The earliest of them was Cassius Hemina, the most important L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi; both beginning with the foundation of Rome and concluding with their own time. Besides these, Fabius Maximus Servilianus and perhaps L. Scribonius Libo belong to this period.

1. Censorin. d. n. 17, 11 (concerning the fourth secular games): at Piso censorius et Cn. Gallius, sed et Cassius Hemina, qui illo tempore vivebat, post annum factos tertium adfirmant, viz. A. V. C. 608. He is called vetustissimus auctor annalium in Pliny N. H. XIII 27, 84, comp. XXXIX 6: Cassius Hemina ex antiquissimis auctor est. It is not certain whether he is identical with L. Cassius censorius in the Schol. Veron. on Aen. II 717. The quotation Cassius Hemina de censoribus libro II in Nonius p. 346, 22 is also uncertain. Of his historical work, called both Annales and Historiae, four books are quoted. The oldest history was treated extensively, taking in also other towns of Italy. The fourth book was entitled bellum punicum posterior (Priscian VII 69 p. 347, 5 sq. H.); the third book seems, therefore, to have treated of the first Punic war, while the second may have contained a short resumé of the Roman history down to the first Punic war (Vahlen, Enn. p. LI note.) As Pliny in his list of authorities quotes him at book XII (arborum naturae), XIV (de peregrinis arboribus et unguentis), XXXII (on remedies), he seems also to have taken in various curiosities. His fragments which it is sometimes difficult to keep apart from those of other Cassii, are collected by Krause p. 155—166, C. L. Roth (1852) p. 288—295, J. E. Schmitter, Cassii Heminae annalium fragmenta emendata, Düsseldorf 1861. 4. See on him Schwegler, H. of R. I p. 87 sq. Gerlach, Historians p. 59 sq.

2. L. Scribonius Libo, trib. pleb. 605. Cic. Brut. 23, 90: Libonem non infantem video fuisse, ut ex orationibus eius intellegi potest. He is probably meant ad Att. XIII 30, 3 (in Libonis annali XIV): cf. 32, 3. 44, 3 (Libonem mecum habeo et habueram ante Cascam).

3. Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus, Cons. 612. Macrob. I 16, 25: Fabius Maximus Servilianus pontifex in libro XII negat oportere atro die parentare. Schol. Veron. ad Georg. III 7: Servilianus historiarum scriptor. Serv. on Aen. I 3: Fabius Maximus annalium primo. Dionys. Ant. I 7: ὡς οἱ πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐπαινούμενοι Ῥωμαίων συνέγραψαν, Πόρκιός τε Κάτων καὶ Φάβιος Μάξιμος καὶ Οὐαλέριος ὁ Ἀντιεύς etc. As Polyb. III 8 seems to know no other historian of the gens Fabia besides Fabius Pictor, Servilianus appears to have begun to write only in his later years. W. Harless, de Fabiis p. 37—44. cf. ib. p. 3.

4. L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, trib. pl. 605, Cons. 621, Censor probably 634 (censorius, n. 1. Plin. N. H. XIII 13, comp. Πίσων Λεύκιος ὁ τιμητικὸς in Dionys. Ant. II 38. 39. XII fr.), the adversary of the Gracchi. His work began with the foundation of Rome and in the 7th book he treated of his own time (Censorin. 17, 13: Piso, in cuius annali septimo scriptum est sic etc.). As to its title, there is the ordinary discrepancy (see n. 1), but as Pliny l. l. says: L. Piso censorius primo commentariorum, O. Jahn (Ber. der sächs. G. d. W. 1848 p. 429 sq.) and Pluess de Cinc. p. 28, n. 83 (in Dionysius also) distinguish two Pisos, while M. Hertz ('Philological and clinical excursion' 1849 p. 15 sqq.) assumes at least a second work of this Piso (of antiquarian contents). Piso certainly did not lack veracity (gravis auctor he is styled by Pliny N. H. II 53, 140) and the references to him which are especially frequent in the first two books of Livy and in Dionysius do not always show good taste, but on the whole simple and sober good sense, and also a tinge of rationalism antipathetic to Niebuhr's romantic mind. Cicero's judgment on Piso's style is unfavourable, but Gellius, a professed admirer of archaic style, pronounces the unaffected diction of his sentences to be simply charming. Brut. 27, 106: Piso et causas egit et multarum legum aut auctor aut dissuasor fuit, isque et orationes reliquit, quae iam evanuerunt, et annales sane exiliter scriptos. Comp. de leg. I 2, 6. de or. II 12, 51 sqq. above 32, 3. On the other hand Gellius VII (VI) 9, 1: res perquam pure et venuste narrata a Pisone. XI 14, 1: simplicissima suavitate et rei et orationis L. Piso Frugi usus est in primo annali. His two instances show that Piso indulged in anecdotes; Pliny quotes him among his authorities at book XII to XVIII (on trees), XXVIII and XXIX (medicinae), XXXIII sq. (metals), XXXVI (stones). Comp. n. 1. His fragments see in Krause p. 139 sqq. C. L. Roth, p. 295—304. Liebaldt, de L. Calpurnio Pisone annalium scriptore, Naumburg 1836. 4. Schwegler, I p. 88 sq. Gerlach, Historians p. 60—62. Kieserling, rer. script. p. 30—35. Mommsen, R. H. II[3] p. 454.

129. These twenty years possess great jurists in Manius Manilius, M. Junius Brutus, Ser. Fabius Pictor, and especially in P. Mucius Scaevola, Cons. a. 621, an acute man, though more thoughtful and easy-going than energetic; it was he who finished the official annals and published them in the shape

of a book. He as well as Manilius and Brutus were eminent writers ou their subjects, especially Manilius as the author of forms of deeds of purchase. Scaevola's brother also, P. Licinius Crassus Mucianus, Cons. 622, was a legal authority, and so was C. Marcius Figulus.

1. M'. Manilius, Cons. 605, one of the circle of Africanus minor; see L. Bröcker in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1481 sq. n. 4. — Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 37: post hos (Cato and his son) fuerunt P. Mucius et Brutus et Manilius qui fundaverunt ius civile. ex his . . libellos reliquit . . Manilius tres, et exstant volumina scripta, Manilii monumenta. Cic. de or. I 58, 246: Manilianas venalium vendendorum leges ediscere. Varro R. R. II 3, 5: Manilius scriptum reliquit sic (the formula of sponsio concerning the purchase of goats). ib. 5, 11: paulo verbosius haec (formula of stipulation) qui Manilii actiones sequuntur. 7, 6 emtio equina similis fere ac boum . . ut in Manilii actionibus sunt perscripta. L. L. VII 5, 105 p. 161 M.: nexum Manilius scribit omne quod per libram et aes geritur. In Varro there is always the various reading Mamilius. Cic. fin. I 4, 12: partus ancillae sitne in fructu habendus disseretur inter principes civitatis, P. Scaevolam Maniumque Manilium, ab iisque M. Brutus dissentiet, . . nosque ea scripta . . legimus libenter. ad Fam. VII 22: ut scires id . . Sex. Aelium, M'. Manilium, M. Brutum sensisse. Cf. ib. 8, 2. p. Caecin. 24, 69: si ut Manilius statuebat, sic est iudicatum. Gell. XVII 7, 3: Q. Scaevola patrem suum et Brutum et Manilium, viros adprime doctos, quaesisse ait etc. Dig. XLI 2, 3, 3: Brutus et Manilius putant etc. As a jurist he is called vir prudens by Cic. rep. I 12, 18, cf. Brut. 28, 108: nec multo minus (than P. Scaevola) prudenter (loqui putabatur) M'. Manilius. de or. III 33, 133: M'. Manilium . . vidimus transverso ambulantem foro, quod erat insigne eum qui id faceret facere civibus omnibus consilii sui copiam.

2. M. Junius Brutus, iuris peritissimus (Cic. Brut. 34, 130, cf. 47, 175; iuris civilis in primis peritus, Off. II 14, 50). Pompon. l. l. 39 he is called praetorius and it is stated of him septem libellos reliquit. On the other hand Cic. de or. II 55, 223: tres Bruti de iure civili libros tribus legendos dedit. p. Cluent. 51, 141: tres excitavit recitatores cum singulis libris quos M. Brutus . . de iure civili reliquit. Quinil. VI 3, 44: tris excitavit lectores hisque (M. Bruti) dialogos dedit legendos. The form of the dialogue appears from Cicero de or. II 55, 224 where it is also said: ex libro tertio, in quo finem scribendi fecit (M. Brutus); tot enim, ut audivi Scaevolam dicere, sunt veri Bruti libri i. e. Scaevola was of opinion that the four other books were continuations of the original work by a jurist of the 7th century. — Cic. de or. II 33, 142: video in Catonis (the younger) et in Bruti libris nominatim ere referri quid alicui de iure viro aut mulieri responderint. Gell. VI (VII) 15, 1. XVII 7, 3. Dig. XLIX 15, 4 (inter Brutum et Scaevolam varie tractatum est).

3. Cic. Brut. 21, 81: Ser. Fulvius (Cons. 619) et una Ser. Fabius Pictor et iuris et litterarum et antiquitatis bene peritus. Gell. I 12, 14: in libro I Fabii Pictoris quae verba pontificem maximum dicere oporteat .. scriptum est. X 15, 1: in libris qui de sacerdotibus publicis compositi sunt, item in Fabii Pictoris primo scriptos legimus. Gellius (see above 105, 7) seems from his way of quoting it to have ascribed the work de iure pontificio to the famous annalist Fabius Pictor, a supposition accepted by Nipperdey, Philol. VI p. 131.

4. P. Mucius Scaevola, Cons. 621, Pontifex maximus since 631, † c. 640 (comp. Ascon. in Milon. p. 46 Or.); see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 181—183, n. 8. — Pompon. l. l. 39 (see n. 1). Supposing the order there to be not appreciative but chronological, Pomponius would appear to confound the father and the son; see W. Teuffel l. l. p. 182 note, cf. also p. 180 note. Pompon. l. l. relates moreover: ex his P. Mucius etiam decem libellos reliquit .. illi duo (Manilius and P. Mucius) consulares fuerunt, P. autem Mucius etiam pontifex maximus. The latter at least after 631, see Cic. de dom. 53, 136. As such he seems to have done away with the writing of the official Annals by the pontifex maximus which had become unnecessary on account of the private annalists; they extended at least only usque ad P. Mucium pontificem maximum (Cic. de or. II 12, 52). At the same time he would seem to have superintended the collection and publication of the annals as far as they existed; see above 66, 2 and 3. Mommsen R. H. II² p. 453. The dignity of pontifex was connected with legal knowledge: Cic. de leg. II 19; 47 (cf. 21, 52): .. Scaevolae (father and son, the latter Cons. 659) pontifices ambo et eidem iuris peritissimi (cf. de leg. II 21, 52). Saepe, inquit P. filius, ex patre audivi pontificem bonum neminem esse nisi qui ius civile cognosset. de or. I 37, 170: P. Crassus ille Dives .. cum P. Scaevolae frater esset, solitus est ei persaepe dicere, neque illum in iure civili satis facere posse nisi dicendi copiam assumpsisset .. neque se ante causas amicorum tractare atque agere coepisse quam ius civile didicisset. Brut. 28, 108: latine loqui putabatur .. P. Scaevola valde prudenter et acute, paulo etiam copiosius. de or. I 56, 240 (of Crassus): id quod ipse diceret et in P. Mucii, fratris sui, libris et in Sex. Aelii commentariis scriptum protulisse. The existing instances of his decisions and sayings prove him to be as careful in defining (Cic. Top. 4, 24. 6, 29. 8, 37. 9, 38) as powerful in casuistry (Cic. de leg. II 22, 57. fin. I 4, 12. Gell. XVII 7, 3. Dig. XXIV 3, 66 pr. XLIX 15, 4. L 7, 17, cf. XLVII 4, 1, 15), especially also in pointing out how laws might be avoided in a legal manner (Cic. leg. II 21, 53). But it was only by a party view that Nasica attributed to him the principle fiat justitia, pereat mundus (Val. Max. III 2, 17: tum Scipio Nasica quoniam, inquit, consul, dum iuris ordinem sequitur, id agit ut cum omnibus legibus romanum imperium corruat etc.). Rutilius Rufus (Cons. 649) was trained by intercourse with him; see below 136, 2; his most brilliant pupil, however, was his son, Cons. 659 (below 141, 1 sqq.).

5. P. Licinius Crassus Dives Mucianus, the brother of the former, but adopted by P. Crassus (Cons. 549; see above 112, 4); Cons. 623, † 624; see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. IV p. 1057 sq. n. 15. cf. Gell. I 13, 10: is Crassus . . traditur habuisse quinque rerum bonarum maxima et praecipua: quod esset ditissimus, quod nobilissimus, quod eloquentissimus, quod iurisconsultissimus, quod pontifex maximus. Cic. de or. I 50, 216: P. Crassus idem fuit eloquens et iuris peritus (so also Brut. 33, 127. Cato mai. 14, 50). Ib. 56, 240: fuit Crassus in numero disertorum, sed par Galbae (above 127, 4) nullo modo. ib. 37, 170 (see n. 4). Brut. 26, 98: P. Crassum valde probatum oratorem . . accepimus qui et ingenio valuit et studio et habuit quasdam etiam domesticas disciplinas. nam . . cum esset P. Muci (Cons. 579) filius fratremque haberet P. Scaevolam (see n. 4) domi ius civile cognoverat. in eo industriam constat summam fuisse maximamque gratiam, cum et consuleretur plurimum et diceret. He is mentioned among the jurists, though with the praenomen L. (perhaps owing to a confusion with the orator L. Crassus, below 139, 3 sq.) and in the wrong place (after Sex. Pompeius and others) by Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 40: L. Crassus, frater P. Mucii (Cons. 621, see n. 4) qui Mucianus dictus est. See also Val. Max. VIII 7, 6: P. Crassus, cum in Asiam ad Aristonicum regem debellandum consul venisset, tanta cura graecae linguae notitiam conprehendit ut eam in quinque divisam genera (i. e. dialects) . . penitus cognosceret. Of course he understood Greek perfectly before.

6. Val. Max. IX 3, 2: C. Figulum mansuetissimum, pacato iuris iudicio (studio?) celeberrimum, son of the Cons. 592 and 598, though he did not attain that dignity himself; hence the vexed question he addressed to his consultores: an vos consulere scitis, consulem facere nescitis?

130. The period of the Gracchi (a. 620—635 V. C.) was a time of civil discord which shook the state to its very foundations. In these excited times eloquence was a powerful weapon, though it availed nothing against brutal force. Gracchus the younger was in this period the most powerful master of eloquence (a. 600—633 V. C.). The kindling power of his speeches is plainly perceptible even in the few specimens now extant. Gaius' elder brother, Tiberius (a. 591—621 V. C.) was inferior to him in eloquence as well as in other matters.

1. Personal circumstances and literary notices. Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, born 591 or 592 V. C.; Quaestor of the Cons. Hostilius Mancinus in the Numantine war (a. 617 = 137), popular tribune 621 = 133, during which office he was exasperated by the opposition raised against his well-intended reform-bills, soon deviated from legal procedures and was killed by the Pontifex maximus P. Nasica (*οὔπω τριάκοντα γεγονώς*, Plut. C. Gracch. 1). Gaius was nine years his junior

(Plut. Tib. Gr. 3. C. Gr. 1), consequently born 600 or 601, 621 sqq. triumvir agris dividundis, 628 sq. Quaestor of the Cons. Aurelius Orestes in Sardinia, popular tribune 631 (123)—633 (121), in the last year he succumbed to the Cons. L. Opimius. A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. VI 1 p. 983—987. Dieckmann, the two Gracchi, Hanover 1851. Th. Lau, the Gracchi and their time, Hamburg 1854. 287 pp. 8. J. Sörgel, de Ti. et C. Gracchis, I Erlangen 1860. 24 pp. 4. II ibid. 1863. 21 pp. 4. III ibid. 1866. 24 pp. 4. A. C. G. Lundenius, de Ti. Sempronio Graccho, Helsingfors 1850. 159 pp. 8. A. G. Kok, quo anno aetatis Ti. Gracchus quaestor fuerit, in his Quaestiones Plutarcheae, Lugd. Bat. 1863.

2. Common and characteristic features of both. Plut. Ti. Gr. 2: *ἰδέᾳ προσώπου καὶ βλέμματι καὶ κινήματι πρᾷος καὶ καταστηματικὸς ἦν ὁ Τιβέριος, ἔντονος δὲ καὶ σφοδρὸς ὁ Γάϊος. . . ὁ λόγος τοῦ μὲν Γαΐου φοβερὸς καὶ περιπαθὴς εἰς δείνωσιν, ἡδίων δ' ὁ τοῦ Τιβερίου καὶ μᾶλλον ἐπαγωγὸς οἴκτου. τῇ δὲ λέξει καθαρὸς καὶ διαπεπονημένος ἀκριβῶς ἐκεῖνος, ὁ δὲ Γαΐου πιθανὸς καὶ γεγανωμένος. τῷ δ' ἤθει . . ὁ μὲν ἐπιεικὴς καὶ πρᾷος, ὁ δὲ τραχὺς καὶ θυμοειδής.* Though the difference is perhaps drawn too sharply here, there is no doubt that Gaius was more excited and embittered by his brother's fate. Liv. LX: C. Gracchus . . eloquentior quam frater. Dio fr. 85 Bk.: *ὁ Γράχχος τὴν μὲν γνώμην ὁμοίαν τῷ ἀδελφῷ εἶχεν . . τῇ δὲ παρασκευῇ τῶν λόγων πολὺ αὐτοῦ προέφερεν.* Cic. Brut. 97, 333: Gracchi in contionibus multo faciliore et liberiore genere dicendi (usi sunt quam superiores). Plin. N. H. XIII 26: longinqua monumenta Tiberii Gaique Gracchorum manus, quae apud Pomponium Secundum . . vidi.

3. Tiberius. Cic. Brut. 27, 103: fuit uterque (Carbo and Tib.) summus orator. 104: et Carbonis et Gracchi habemus orationes nondum satis splendidas verbis, sed acutas prudentiaeque plenissimas. fuit Gracchus . . graecis litteris eruditus. nam semper habuit exquisitos e Graecia magistros, in eis iam adolescens Diophanem Mytilenaeum (comp. Plut. Ti. 8. 20), Graeciae temporibus illis disertissumum. de harusp. resp. 19, 41: Ti. Gracchus convellit statum civitatis: qua gravitate vir, qua eloquentia, qua dignitate! App. b. c. I 9: *Τιβέριος Σεμπρώνιος Γράχχος, ἀνὴρ ἐπιφανὴς καὶ λαμπρὸς ἐς φιλοτιμίαν, εἰπεῖν τε δυνατώτατος.* That his participation in the Numantine stipulations was early made use of in the schools of rhetoricians, appears from Quintil. VII 4, 13: interdum culpa in hominem relegatur: ut si Gracchus reus foederis numantini . . missum se ab imperatore suo diceret. Martian. Cap. V p. 149, 18 sqq. Eyss.: remotio est cum obiectum crimen in alterum vel in aliud . . removetur. in alium, ut Ti. Gracchus in Mancinum qui auctor faciendi foederis fuit. It may, therefore, appear doubtful whether the arguments attributed to Tib. by Plut. (Ti. Gr. 9. 15, as specimens of the *πιθανότης* and *πυκνότης τοῦ ἀνδρός*) and App. (b. c. I 9) are really drawn from his speeches or merely the exaggerations of rhetors and rhetorical historians (e. g. Fannius and Livy). Plutarch's source seems, however, actually to have contained spe-

cimens of the speeches of at least Gaius; comp. C. Gr. 4 extr.: *τοιαύτη μὲν ἡ πικρία τῶν λόγων ἦν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλὰ λαβεῖν ἐκ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἔστιν ὅμοια.*

4. Gaius. General characteristics of his eloquence. Plut. C. Gr. 1: *τὸν λόγον ὥσπερ ὠκύπτερα κατασκευαζόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν πολιτείαν . . ἀπέδειξε τοὺς ἄλλους ῥήτορας παίδων* (infantium) *μηδὲν διαφέροντας.* 3: *ἰσχύων τῷ λέγειν ὡς ἄλλος οὐδείς.* 4: *ἦν δὲ καὶ μεγαλοφωνότατος καὶ ῥωμαλεώτατος ἐν τῷ λέγειν.* Cic. de harusp. resp. 19, 41: C. Gracchus quo ingenio, qua eloquentia, quanta vi, quanta gravitate dicendi! pro Font. 17, 39: exstat oratio hominis, ut opinio mea fert, nostrorum hominum longe ingeniosissimi atque eloquentissumi, C. Gracchi. Brut. 33, 125: vir et praestantissumo ingenio et flagranti studio et doctus a puero, C. Gracchus. noli enim putare quemquam pleniorem aut uberiorem ad dicendum fuisse. . . damnum illius immaturo interitu res romanae latinaeque litterae fecerunt. 126: eloquentia nescio an habuisset parem neminem. grandis est verbis, sapiens sententiis, genere toto gravis: manus extrema non accessit operibus eius; praeclare incohata multa, perfecta non plane. Tac. dial. 18: Catoni seni comparatus C. Gracchus plenior et uberior. 26: malim C. Gracchi impetum. In Fronto's time the interest in Gracchus revived. Fronto Epist. p. 145 N.: tribunalia Catonis et Gracchi et Ciceronis orationibus celebrata. p. 114: contionatur Cato infeste, Gracchus turbulente, Tullius copiose. iam in iudiciis saevit idem Cato, triumphat Cicero, tumultuatur Gracchus, Calvus rixatur. p. 54: oratores veteres, quorum aut pauci aut praeter Catonem et Gracchum nemo tubam inflat. His study of Gr.'s speeches appears also from p. 56. 61. 105. To this revived interest we owe the preservation of some valuable fragments of his eloquence by Gellius, esp. N. A. X 3, 3—5. XI 10. 13, 3. XV 12. Dio again uses secondary sources, hostile to C. Gracchus; see fr. 85 Bk., where we also read: *πολλῇ μὲν πυκνότητι ἐνθυμημάτων, πολλῇ δὲ καὶ σφοδρότητι ὀνομάτων ἐπίπαν ἐδημηγόρει.*

5. The manner of C. Gracchus' eloquence: his delivery very lively (Plut. C. Gr. 4); he advised modulation of the voice (Cic. de or. III 60, 225. Plut. C. Gr. 4 extr. de cohib. ira 6. cf. Val. Max. VIII 10, 1. Quintil. I 10, 27. Gell. I 11, 10 sqq. Dio l. l.); his gestures were excited, he would walk up and down and bare his arm (Plut. Ti. Gr. 2. Dio fr. 85 Bk.). Cic. de or. III 56, 214: quae sic ab illo esse acta constabat oculis, voce, gestu, inimici ut lacrimas tenere non possent. His remarks against the pride of the aristocrats and his individual opponents were sometimes very cutting: Schol. Vat. in Cic. or. p. Flacc. 2, 16. p. 233 Or.; against Piso C. Gracchi exstat oratio maledictorum magis plena quam criminum; comp. Cic. p. Font. 17, 39. Cic. Tusc. III 20, 48: lege orationes Gracchi: patronum aerarii esse dices. He chose the best expressions, Cic. de or. I 34, 154. — Gell. XI 13, 2: in eius orationis principio collocata verba sunt accuratius modulatiusque quam veterum oratorum consuetudo fert. On his exordia see above 36, 5. Cic. Brut. 26, 100 reports that he employed the rhetor Menelaus from

Marathus. Fragments of (17) speeches in Meyer, or. rom. fragm. p. 116—128 = 227—249 ed. II.

6. Cic. de divin. I 18, 36: Ti. Gracchus P. f. . . nonne, ut C. Gracchus, filius eius, scriptum reliquit, duobus anguibus domi conprehensis haruspices convocavit! More accurately ib. II 29, 62: C. Gracchus ad M. Pomponium scripsit duobus anguibus domi conprehensis haruspices a patre convocatos. Comp. Plut. Ti. Gr. 1. From this it appears that the work in question had the form of a letter and was at all events no speech, but probably a political pamphlet. Plut. Ti. Gr. 8 may perhaps refer to this: ὃ δ' ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ Γάϊος ἔν τινι βιβλίῳ γέγραφεν (the reason of Tiberius' leges agrariae).

131. Among the orators of this period were on the side of the Gracchi only the brothers Crassus and Scaevola (above 129, 4 and 5), Tiberius' father-in-law Appius Claudius (Cons. 611), M. Fulvius Flaccus (Cons. 629), C. Papirius Carbo (Cons. 634) and P. Decius (Praetor 639); on the opposite side we find Ti. Annius Luscus (Cons. 601), Q. Metellus (above 127, 7), P. Nasica (Cons. 616), L. Piso Frugi (above 128, 4), P. Popilius (Cons. 622), C. Fannius (Cons. 632), Q. Aelius Tubero (below 134, 2), M. Scaurus (Cons. 639), M. Livius Drusus (Cons. 642). The political party of the orator C. Scribonius Curio (Praetor 633) is unknown.

1. Cic. Acad. pr. II 5, 13: duo sapientissimos et clarissimos fratres, P. Crassum et P. Scaevolam, aiunt Ti. Graccho legum auctores fuisse, alterum quidem palam, alterum obscurius.

2. Appi Claudi volubilis, sed paulo fervidior erat oratio, Cic. Brut. 28, 108. Ap. Claudius C. f. Polc(er) on a limes Gracchanus; Censor 618; A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. II p. 410, n. 26.

3. Cic. Brut. 28, 108: in aliquo numero (erant) etiam M. Fulvius Flaccus et C. Cato . . mediocres oratores, etsi Flacci scripta sunt, sed ut studiosi litterarum (literary dilettanti). Pauly's Encycl. III p. 532, comp. 534.

4. C. Papirius C. f. Carbo, trib. pl. 623, praetor 629, Cons. 634; C. Fuchs in Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 1145 sq. n. 2. Cic. Brut. 27, 104: et Carbonis . . habemus orationes (above 130, 3). 105: Carbo . . est in multis iudiciis causisque cognitus. hunc . . L. Gellius . . canorum oratorem et volubilem (comp. de or. III 7, 28) et satis acrem atque eundem et vehementem et valde dulcem et perfacetum (cf. Lael. 25, 96) fuisse dicebat; addebat industrium etiam et diligentem et in exercitationibus commentationibusque multum operae solitum esse ponere (comp. Quintil. X 7, 27: C. Carbo etiam in tabernaculo solebat hac uti exercitatione dicendi). 106: hic optimus illis temporibus est patronus habitus. Cf. 43, 159 and 62, 221 (eloquentissumus homo); 27, 103 (summus

orator). His culture seems, however, to have been exclusively rhetorical, as he, like Galba and Porcina (above 127, 4 and 5) understood little of leges, instituta maiorum, and ius civile (Cic. de or. I 10, 40). He was, moreover, unprincipled as well as talented; though a friend of C. Gracchus (Cic. Lael. 11, 39. Mil. 3, 8. Val. Max. VI 2, 3) he as consul defended and praised his murderer L. Opimius (Cic. de or. II 25, 106. 39, 165. 40, 169).

5. Cic. Brut. 28, 108: Flacci (n. 9) aemulus P. Decius fuit, non infans ille quidem, sed ut vita sic oratione etiam turbulentus (he accused L. Opimius a. 634). See A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. II p. 879, n. 7.

6. Cic. Brut. 20, 79: et T. Annium Luscum, Q. Fulvi collegam (in the consulship) non indisertum dicunt fuisse. Comp. Plut. Ti. Gr. 14: *Τίτος Ἄννιος, οὐκ ἐπιεικὴς μὲν οὐδὲ σώφρων ἄνθρωπος, ἐν δὲ λόγῳ περὶ τὰς ἐρωτήσεις καὶ ἀποκρίσεις ἄμαχος εἶναι δοκῶν.* He is perhaps the same Annius against whom Cato major made a speech (Festus p. 305 M.). See W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. I 1 p. 1022, n. 11.

7. P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio (Cons. 616), Cic. Brut. 28, 107: Attius . . illum . . cum omnibus in rebus vehementem tum acrem aiebat in dicendo fuisse. C. Krafft in Pauly's Encyclop. II p. 667 sq. n. 13.

8. P. Popillius C. f. Laenas, Cons. 622 (cf. C. I. lat. I 550 sq. p. 154. Haakh l. l. V p. 1900 sq. n. 10), cum civis egregius (in persecuting the adherents of T. Gracchus) tum non indisertus fuit, Cic. Brut. 25, 95.

9. C. Fannius C. f. Strabo, Cons. 632. Cic. Brut. 26, 99: unam orationem de sociis et nomine latino contra C. Gracchum reliquit sane et bonam et nobilem. 100: cum Fannius numquam sit habitus elinguis. nam et causas defensitavit et tribunatus eius (a. 612 or 613), arbitrio et auctoritate P. Africani gestus, non obscurus fuit. Passages from his speech against C. Gracchus are quoted by Cic. de or. III 47, 183. Jul. Victor in Halm's Rhet. lat. min. p. 402. Charis. I p. 143, 13 K.

10. M. Aemilius M. f. L. n. Scaurus, born a. 591, of a noble, but poor family, by his energy, versatility and shrewdness gradually became the leader of the aristocratie party in the time after the Gracchi; he was consul a. 639, Censor 645, and for a long time princeps senatus, † c. 665. See W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. I 1 p. 370—372. Opimium contra Gracchum . . privato consilio armavit, Aur. Vict. ill. 72, 9. As he was always careful of good appearances, he composed for this purpose an autobiography (tres ad L. Fufidium libri scripti de vita ipsius, Cic. Brut. 29, 112, cf. 35, 132 and Val. Max. IV 4, 11 according to Köchly's emendation), though this was not much read, probably on account of its undisguised apologetic character (Cic. l. l.). It is possible that Cicero's recommendation prolonged the existence of this work for a few centuries; curious expressions, such as sagittis confictus, poteratur, possitur, are quoted from Scaurus de vita sua down to Diomedes (Historicorum reliquiae ed C. L. Roth p. 327 sq.) and not only in Val. Max. IV 4, 11 and Frontinus Strat. IV 3, 13 we find notices taken from it, but in so late a writer as Aurel. Victor the chapter on

Scaurus (ill. 72) is indirectly derived from this source. Cicero knew also of speeches by him (Brut. 29, 112: huius et orationes sunt), as it seems both judicial and political. Brut. 29, 111: in Scauri oratione .. gravitas summa et naturalis quaedam inerat auctoritas .. 112: hoc dicendi genus ad patrocinia mediocriter aptum videbatur, ad senatoriam vero sententiam .. vel maxime. de or. I 49, 214: quamquam est in dicendo minime contemnendus, prudentia tamen rerum magnarum magis quam dicendi arte nititur (in his public position).

11. M. Livius C. f. Drusus, trib. pl. a. 632, Cons. 642; W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1108 sq. n. 6. Vir et oratione gravis et auctoritate, Cic. Brut. 28, 109, comp. Plut. C. Gr. 8: *ἦθει καὶ λόγῳ καὶ πλούτῳ τοῖς μάλιστα τιμωμένοις .. ἐνάμιλλος.*

12. C. Scribonius Curio, Praetor 633, the first of three orators of the familia Curionum, in qua tres continua serie oratores exstiterunt (Plin. N. H. VII 41 cf. also Schol. Ambros. in Cic. or. in Clod. et Cur. p. 330 Or.). Cic. de or. II 23, 98 calls him vel eloquentissimus temporibus illis. More accurately Brut. 32, 122: fuit .. sane illustris orator, cuius de ingenio ex orationibus eius existumari potest. sunt enim et aliae et pro Ser. Fulvio de incestu nobilis oratio. nobis quidem pueris haec omnium optuma putabatur. Cf. ib. 124. A passage from it is quoted in Cic. de inv. I 43, 80 = ad Herenn. II 20, 33. Scripsit etiam alia nonnulla (speeches) et multa dixit et illustria, et in numero patronorum fuit, Brut. 32, 124.

132. Most of the historians of this period tried to raise themselves from the style of the old annalists. Vennonius and Clodius Licinus did not do so, but it holds good all the more of C. Fannius who limited himself to contemporary history and described it with great truthfulness, of L. Caelius Antipater in his rhetorical history of the second Punic war, and of P. Sempronius Asellio with regard to his subject matter, he also confining himself to what he had seen, and studying to attain a kind of pragmatism. The writings of Fannius and Asellio thus approached the character of memoirs and resembled autobiographies. To this period belongs also the conclusion of the official annals and their publication in the shape of a book (above 66, 1 and 2).

1. *Γναῖος Γέλλιος* in the history of the regal period is quoted by Dionys. Hal. II 31. 76. cf. *Γέλλιος* IV 6. VI 11 (*οἱ περὶ Γέλλιον*). VII 1. Cn. Gellii annalem tertium with a prayer of Hersilia in Gell. N. A. XIII 23 (22), 13, cf. XVIII 12, 6: Cn. Gellius in annalibus. ib. VIII 14 contained verba quaedam ex Naevio poeta et Cn. Gellio non usitate collocata. Censorin. d. n. 17, 11: Piso censorius et Cn. Gellius. Macrob. Sat. I 16, 21: Gellius annalium libro XV et Cassius Hemina. Charis. I

15 p. 54, 13 sqq. K.: Gellius in II . . et in V . . et in VII . . idem Gellius XCVII (? exc. Cauchii XXVII). p. 55, 7 (also p. 139, 2): Gellius libro XXIII (? Cauch. XXXVI; in Prisc. VII 37 p. 750 P. = p. 318, 4 sq. Htz. the same fragment from Gellius libro XXX). The work seems certainly to have been long and detailed. It is doubtful whether this annalist (Nipperdey, Philol. VI p. 132 sq.) is the same Cn. Gellius against whom Cato the Elder made a speech (Gell. N. A. XIV 2, 21—26) or only his son (A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. III p. 661 sq.). Cic. leg. I 2, 6 (above 32, 3) is not decisive, the passage being superficial in other respects, and the mss. besides not having Gellius, but belli. — Krause fragm. hist. p. 202 sqq. C. L. Roth p. 304—308. Schwegler R. G. I p. 80.

2. Cic. leg. I 2, 6: Fabium aut . . Catonem aut Pisonem aut Fannium aut Vennonium. ad Att. XII 3, 1: moleste fero Vennonii me historiam non habere. Dionys. Hal. IV 15 *ὡς Οὐεννώνιος ἱστόρηκεν.*

3. Cic. Brut. 26, 101: alter C. Fannius, M. f., Laeli gener, et moribus et ipso genere dicendi durior. is soceri instituto . . Panaetium audiverat. eius omnis in dicendo facultas ex historia ipsius non ineleganter scripta perspici potest. Comp. ib. 31, 118 and above n. 2. He was the companion of Ti. Gracchus in the third Punic war (Plut. Ti. Gr. 4) and (a. 612) in Spain (Appian. Hisp. 67). Afterwards he was praetor (*Φάννιος Μάρκου υἱὸς στρατηγός*, Joseph. antiq. XIII 9, 2). Victorin. in Cic. rhet. I 20 p. 57 Or. = 203, 27 Halm: Sallustius . . in libro I Historiarum dat Catoni brevitatem, . . Fannio vero veritatem. The highest number of books quoted: C. Fannius in VIII annali (Schol. Ver. ad Aen. III 707) or C. Fannius annalium VIII (Charis. I 21 p. 124, 1 K.). As the style seems, moreover, to have been quite discursive (see Cic. Brut. 21, 81 who says that Metellus' speech contra Ti. Gracchum exposita est in C. Fanni annalibus) and as no fragments refer to any anterior event, but all to contemporary history, (e. g. Cic. de or. II 67, 270: Fannius in annalibus suis Africanum Aemilianum . . appellat *εἴρωνα* = Brut 87, 299: ut ait in historia sua C. Fannius), the work seems to have merely contained the latter. It must in that case have been of special importance for the period of the Gracchi (see H. Peter, the sources of Plutarch p. 97 sq.). M. Brutus (below 199, 1) made an abridgment of it: epitome Bruti Fanniana an (?) Bruti epitoma Fannianorum, Cic. ad Att. XII 5, 3. — C. L. Roth hist. p. 311—318. A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. III p. 421, n. 5.

4. Cic. leg. I 2, 6: Fannii aetate (a dative) coniunctus Antipater paulo inflavit vehementius habuitque vires agrestis ille quidem et horridas, sine nitore ac palaestra etc. de or. II 12, 54: paululum se erexit et addidit historiae maiorem sonum vocis vir optimus, Crassi familiaris, Antipater. Brut. 26, 102: L. Caelius Antipater scriptor . . fuit ut temporibus illis luculentus, iuris valde peritus, multorum etiam, ut L. Crassi (born 614) magister. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 60: Caelius Antipater qui historias conscripsit, sed plus eloquentiae quam scientiae iuris operam dedit. His legal knowledge justifies the assumption of Roman nationality. At all events he was no freedman; see Suet. rhet. 3 (above

31, 3). That he belonged to the period of the Gracchi, appears from Cic. de divin. I 26, 56: C. Gracchus multis dixit, ut scriptum apud eundem Caelium est, sibi in somnis .. fratrem visum esse .. Hoc antequam tribunus pl. C. Gracchus factus est et se audisse scribit Caelius et illum dixisse multis. See Val. Max. I 7, 6, Caelius etiam certus romanae historiae auctor, sermonem de ea re ad suas aures illo adhuc vivo pervenisse scribit. Antipater wrote, therefore, his work after the death of C. Gracchus. Vellei. II 9, 6, vetustior Sisenna fuit Caelius. Cic. orat. 69, 230, quod (traicere verba quo melius cadat oratio) se L. Caelius Antipater in prooemio belli punici nisi necessario facturum negat. .. Et hic quidem, qui hanc a Laelio (Vossius: L. Aelio) ad quem scripsit, .. veniam petit, et utitur ea traiectione verborum et nihilo tamen aptius explet concluditque sententias. Very likely a declaration to this effect was made at the beginning of the whole work, and not of some part of it, and probably it dealt with the second Punic war, the few fragments not treating of it forming digressions. Comp. Cic. de divin. I 24, 49 hoc item in Sileni, quem Caelius sequitur, graeca historia est; is autem diligentissume res Hannibalis persecutus est. The work is sometimes styled generally historiae, sometimes annalis or annales in agreement with its arrangement and character. It probably contained seven books, as a higher number is never quoted, though the 7th book itself is quoted more than once. Antipater was not deficient in critical faculty (Caelius: ex scriptis eorum qui veri arbitrantur, Prisc. VIII 4, 18 p. 383, 11 Htz) and love of truth (Liv. XXI 46, 10. XXVII 27, 13), but from Cicero's reserved commendation it might appear that these good qualities were obscured by a rhetorical style. The fragments too show a predilection for lengthened descriptions (Liv. XXIX 27, 13 sqq. Non. Marc. p. 137, 16), exaggerations and carelessness in numerical statements (Liv. XXIX 25: 3: Caelius ut abstinet numero ita ad immensum multitudinis speciem auget). Perhaps Livy used him in his account of the second Punic war more frequently to adorn his narrative than he confesses M. Brutus had abridged this work also (cf. n. 3 end); Cic. ad Att. XIII 8, epitomen Bruti Caelianorum velim mihi mittas, and comp. Charis. II p. 195 P. = 220, 12: Brutus et Coelius frequenter eo usi sunt. Antipater was also commented on with regard to his archaic forms (perhaps in the time of Hadrian). Charis. I p. 115 P. = 143, 9 sq. K., Paulus in Coelii hist(oriarum or -ae) libr. I, cf. ib. II p. 193 P. = 217 sq. K. The fragments of Antipater have been collected by Krause (p. 190—201), C. L. Roth (p. 313—322), Meltzer (p. 15—39). Concerning him see also the prize essays of W. Groen van Prinsterer (Lugd. Bat. 1821. 4.) and R. A. Nauta (ib. 1822. 4.); A. Krause, hist. fragm. p. 182—189; L. Kieserling, de scriptoribus p. 35—38; A. Meltzer, de L. Coelio Antipatro belli punici secundi scriptore etc. Lips. 1867.

5. Liv. XXIX 22, 10: hunc Pleminium Clodius Licinus in libro III rerum romanarum refert etc. From this he appears to have treated the same subject as Antipater, and he is probably the Clodius mentioned by Cic. leg. I 2, 6 as the successor of the latter who, he says,

wrote ad antiquorum languorem et inscitiam. In other passages the distribution among the various Claudii (espec. the Quadrigarius) and Clodii or Licinii is doubtful. See C. L. Roth, hist. p. 322 sq.

6. Sempronius Asellio. His praenomen is not known; an A. Sempronius Asellio was killed a. 665 as praetor (Liv. LXXIV. Val. Max. IX 7, 4. Appian. b. c. I 54). Is Asellio sub P. Scipione Africano tribunus militum ad Numantiam (a. 620 sq., see above 122, 1) fuit (like Rutilius Rufus; see 136, 1) resque eas quibus gerendis ipse interfuit conscripsit (Gell. II 13, 3). Besides the dubious quotation Asellio rerum romanarum XL (XI? XX?) in Charis. II 14, 31 p. 176 P. = 195, 18 K. (referred by Mommsen to the destruction of the Piraeus by Sulla), the highest number of books occurs ib. p. 195 P. = 220, 14: Sempronius Asellio historiarum XIV; comp. Gell. XIII 22 (21), 8: Sempronius Asellio in libro rerum gestarum XIV. Comp. C. Nipperdey Phil. VI p. 136. Th. Mommsen, Rh. Mus. XVI p. 450 sq. note. The death of Ti. Gracchus (a. 621) was told in the fifth book (Gell. II 13, 2. 4 sq.). Schol. Bern. on Georg. III 474 probably refers to a. 641: Norica castella dixit ab urbe Noreia quae est in Gallia, ut Asellio historiarum non ignarus (Th. Mommsen: perhaps hist. rom. nono) docet. Asellio was dissatisfied with the ordinary manner of the Annalists; his own principles he lays down in a fragment in Gellius V 18, 8 sq. (see above 32, 5): nobis non modo satis esse video quod factum esset, id pronuntiare, sed etiam quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent demonstrare. . . nam neque alacriores ad remp. defendundam neque segniores ad rem perperam faciundam annales libri commovere quidquam possunt. scribere autem bellum initum quo consule . . sit . . et eo libro quae in bello gesta sint . . non praedicare aut interea quid senatus decreverit aut quae lex rogatiove lata sit . ., id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere. Cic. leg. I 2, 6 it is true, places him beside Gellius and Clodius and much beneath Antipater; but this is due to a one-sided attention to style or to superficial acquaintance with Asellio's work. The fragments in Krause p. 218—221. Roth p. 323—326.

133. In this period we have as antiquarians C. Sempronius Tuditanus (Cons. 625) and M. Junius, a partisan of the Gracchi; the first was the author of an historical work and of libri magistratuum, the latter of a work de potestatibus. The poet L. Attius who flourished about this time was also a scholar (above 119, 7. 8. 11). Others were especially busy in making the old literature accessible and intelligible, e. g. Lampadio and Vargunteius.

1. C. Sempronius C. f. C. n. Tuditanus, triumphed as consul Kal. Oct. 625 de Iapudibus (C. I. lat. I p. 459, XXI). A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 1 p. 976 sq. n. 20. Cic. Brut. 25, 95: C. Tuditanus cum omni vita atque victu excultus atque expolitus tum eius elegans est habitus etiam orationis genus. Dionys. Hal. I 11 *οἱ λογιώτατοι τῶν*

ῥωμαϊκῶν συγγραφέων, ἐν οἷς ἐστι Πόρκιός τε Κάτων . . καὶ Γάϊος Σεμπρώνιος καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοί. Comp. ib. I 13. The notice there given concerning the aborigines of Italy is probably taken from his history, as well as the one about Regulus in Gell. VII (VI) 4, 1 and about the triumph of Flaminius in Plut. Flam. 14. Hence his work seems to have been after the manner of the annalists in dealing both with archaic and contemporary history. Besides this, Tuditanus is quoted libro III magistratuum (Macrob. Sat. I 13, 21) on leap-years, and in commentario XIII C. Tuditani (Messala ap. Gell. XIII 15, 4) on the praetor, and to this work may also belong the notices concerning the nundinae (Macrob. S. I 16, 32) and the trib. pl. (Ascon. ad Cornel. p. 76 Or.). In treating of leap-years, which were by some connected with Numa, the author may there also have mentioned the supposed books of Numa found a. 573 V. C. (above 62, 3), and we may therefore understand of the same work Plin. N. H. XIII 13, 27 hoc idem tradit L. Piso censorius primo commentariorum . . Tuditanus tertio decimo, Numae decretorum fuisse. The fragments of Tuditanus in Krause p. 179—182, Roth p. 309—311.

2. Plin. N. H. XXXIII 2, 9 idque duravit ultra C. Gracchum. Iunius certe, qui ab amicitia eius Gracchanus appellatus est, scriptum reliquit. Censorin. d. n. 20, 2 magis Iunio Gracchano et Fulvio et Varroni et Suetonio credendum; cf. ib. 4. 22, 9. above 115, 1. Varro L. L. VI 33: ut Fulvius scribit et Iunius; cf. ib. V 42. 48. 55. VI 95: in M. Iunii commentariis. Ulp. Dig. I 13, 1 pr.: Gracchanus denique Iunius libro septimo de potestatibus, from which Lyd. de magistr. I 24: Ἰούνιος Γρακχιανὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἐξουσιῶν. The work was addressed to his friend Pomponius, the father of Atticus (Cic. leg. III 20, 49: de potestatum iure . . pluribus verbis scripsit ad patrem tuum M. Iunius sodalis, perite meo quidem iudicio et diligenter). The scanty fragments show that Iunius endeavoured to combine the investigation of the subject-matter with verbal definitions; partiality to Gracchus cannot be traced in them; Gellius XIV 8, 1 sq. even excluding it altogether. Nor can direct use of Gracchanus' work be proved after Varro. Niebuhr's gratuitous assumptions have here caused much confusion. The fragments of Gracchanus have been collected and explained by H. E. Dirksen in his 'fragments of the writings' of the Roman jurists' (Königsb. 1814) p. 56—60. A. Krause, hist. p. 221 sq. L. Mercklin, de Iunio Gracchano, Part. I. II. Dorpat 1840. 1841. M. Hertz, de Cinciis (1842) p. 88—109. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. IV (1849) p. 534 sq. J. Becker in the Ztschfr. f. AW. 1854 n. 16. F. D. Gerlach, the Roman historians (1855) p. 84—88.

3. Sueton. gramm. 2 p. 100 sq. Rffsch.: primus . . studium grammaticae in urbem intulit Crates Mallotes . . qui missus ad senatum ab Attalo rege inter secundum ac tertium bellum punicum, sub ipsam Enni mortem . . nostris exemplo fuit ad imitandum: hactenus tamen ut carmina parum adhuc divolgata vel defunctorum amicorum, vel si quorum aliorum probassent, diligentius retractarent ac legendo commentandoque et ceteris nota facerent; ut C. Octavius Lampadio Naevii

Punicum bellum . . (above 83, 8), ut postea Q. Vargunteius Annales Enni (above 90, 4) . . Instruxerunt auxeruntque ab omni parte grammaticam L. Aelius (below 137) etc.

134. The Stoic philosophy was in the Gracchan period professed by C. Blossius of Cumae, the faithful friend of Tiberius Gracchus, and by Q. Tubero (Cons. 636), a man of high principles, but also of one-sided mind, and who was also a jurist. In the augur Q. Scaevola (Cons. 637) legal knowledge preponderated over his Stoicism. Juridical works were in this period composed by C. Livius Drusus.

1. Plut. Ti. Gr. 8: *Διοφάνους τοῦ ῥήτορος καὶ Βλοσσίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου παρορμησάντων αὐτόν. ὧν . . ἦν . . ὁ Βλ. αὐτόθεν ἐξ Ἰταλίας Κυμαῖος, Ἀντιπάτρου τοῦ Ταρσέως γεγονὼς ἐν ἄστει συνήθης καὶ τετιμημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προσφωνήσεσι γραμμάτων φιλοσόφων.* Comp. ib. 20. Cic. Lael. 11, 37. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. I 2 p. 2399, n. 2.

2. Q. Aelius Tubero, the son of a daughter of L. Aemilius Paulus and sister of Africanus minor, praetor probably 631, cos. suff. 636, a favourite pupil of Panaetius. His Stoicism was not unfavourable to his juridical studies, but an impediment to his eloquence, and as he carried it out most rigorously in practice, he appeared to his contemporaries as a crotchety personage: see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. I 1 p. 334 sq. n. 4. Cic. Lael. 11, 37: Ti. Gracchum remp. vexantem a Q. Tuberone . . derelictum videbamus. Brut. 31, 117: Q. Aelius Tubero fuit . . nullo in oratorum numero, sed vita severus et congruens cum ea disciplina quam colebat, paulo etiam durior. . . ut vita sic oratione durus, incultus, horridus. . . fuit autem constans civis et fortis et in primis C. Graccho molestus, quod indicat Gracchi in eum oratio. sunt etiam in Gracchum Tuberonis. is fuit mediocris in dicendo, doctissimus in disputando. His funeral speech on his uncle Africanus was, therefore, composed by C. Laelius (Cic. de or. II 84, 341). Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 40: Q. Tubero, ille stoicus, Panaetii auditor, qui et ipse consul. Cic. ap. Gell. I 22, 7 nec vero scientia iuris maioribus suis Q. Aelius Tubero defuit, doctrina etiam superfuit, explained by Gellius: disciplinas enim Tubero stoicas et dialecticas percalluerat. Panaetius himself, Hecaton and Poseidon addressed philosophical writings to him.

3. Q. Mucius Q. f. Q. n. Scaevola, distinguished from his nephew of the same name (below 141, 1) by the appellation of augur, born c. 595 (a. 625 he is iam aetate quaestorius, Cic. de rep. I 12, 18), Cons. 637, died later than 666 (Val. Max. III 8, 5). See W. Teuffel in Pauly V p. 183 sq. n. 10. He was no real orator (Cic. Brut. 26, 102: oratorum in numero non fuit; cf. de or. I 10, 39. 49, 214. 55, 234) much less a philosopher, though a friend of Panaetius (Cic. de or. I 11, 45). His excellence lay in 'respondere de iure', but he seems not to have

written anything. Vellej. II 9, 2: Q. Mucius iuris scientia quam propriae eloquentiae nomine celebrior fuit. Cic. Brut. 26, 102: iuris civilis intellegentia atque omni prudentiae genere praestitit. 58, 212: peritissimus iuris idemque percomis est habitus. Atticus and Cicero as adulescentuli used to assist at his consultations (Cic. legg. I 4, 13. Lael. I 1. Brut. 89, 306). With all his firmness of character he was at the same time an amiable person (comiter, ut solebat, Cic. de or. I 9, 35 and 55, 234, eximia suavitate), even a ioculator (ad Att. IV 16, 3) and may therefore be the same Q. Scaevola whom Pliny Ep. V 3, 5 mentions between Q. Catulus and Ser. Sulpicius as the author of lasciva carmina. He may also perhaps be the *Μούχιος Σκευόλας* whose epigram on a representation of Pan amidst goats stands Anth. Pal. IX 217 (Anth. gr. ed. Iacobs II p. 241). The complimentary epigram on Cicero's youthful poem Marius (Q. Cic. ap. Cic. de legg. I 1, 2 ut ait Scaevola de fratris mei Mario, canescet saeclis innumerabilibus) might also be by him, as far as time and other circumstances are concerned; but may with more probability be attributed to his son who a. 695 was among the cohors amicorum of the poetaster Q. Cicero (Pauly's Encycl. V p. 188, n. 17): see M. Haupt, Trans. of the Sax. Society II p. 52.

4. C. Livius C. f. Drusus, as his praenomen shows, the elder brother of the Cons. of 642 (above 131, 11). Cic. Tusc. V 38, 112: C. Drusi domum compleri a consultoribus solitam accepimus; . . caecum adhibebat ducem. Val. Max. VIII 7, 4: Livius Drusus qui et aetatis viribus et acie oculorum defectus ius civile populo benignissime interpretatus est utilissimaque discere id cupientibus monumenta composuit.

135. The bloody suppression of the Gracchic movement increased the haughtiness of the nobility to the highest degree and brought about the disgraceful acts of the war with Jugurtha (a. 643—648), but also stirred up an avenger in the person of C. Marius. In respect to literature the years between 635 and 650 V. C. are the period in which C. Lucilius and L. Afranius flourished. As for orators, we should mention the grandson of Cato the Elder, Cons. 636, Q. Metellus (645), the Epicurean T. Albucius lashed by Lucilius, C. Galba, C. Fimbria (Cons. 650) and others.

1. Besides Lucilius (above 122), and L. Afranius (above 121), we also meet in this period with Atta (above 120), the erotic poets Pompilius, Valerius Aedituus and Catulus (above 123), the learned A. Valerius Soranus (above 124, 1), A. Furius (above 123, 4) and Porcius Licinus (above 123, 3). The strange humourist Valerius Valentinus seems also to belong to this period. Festus p. 363 M.: Tappulam legem convivalem ficto nomine conscripsit iocoso carmine Valerius Valentinus, cuius meminit Lucilius. Val. Max. VIII 1, 8: C. Cosconium Servilia lege reum . . Valeri Valentini accusatoris eius recitatum in iudicio carmen, in quo

puerum praetextatum et ingenuam virginem a se corruptam poetico ioco significaverat, erexit. See A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 2346, n. 65.

2. Gell. XIII 20 (19), 10: M. Cato M. f. M. n. is satis vehemens orator fuit multasque orationes ad exemplum avi scriptas reliquit et consul cum Q. Marcio Rege fuit (a. 636 = 118) inque eo consulatu in Africa . . mortem obit. It is strange that Cicero in his Brutus should not mention him. Perhaps, however, his speeches may have been mixed up with those of his grandfather. See, moreover, Festus p. 154, 25 sqq. Priscian III p. 602 P. = p. 90, 12 sqq. Htz. (Cato nepos de actionibus ad populum ne lex sua abrogetur).

3. Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus, Cons. 645 = 109 (against Jugurtha), Censor 652; see A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. II p. 30 sq. n. 21. Vellej: II 9, 1 mentions him and Scaurus as second-rate orators of their time. See also Cic. Brut. 35, 135. Gell. I 6, 1: oratio Metelli Numidici, gravis ac diserti viri, quam in censura dixit ad populum de ducendis uxoribus. Liv. LIX: Q. Metellus censor censuit ut cogerentur omnes ducere uxores liberorum creandorum causa. exstat oratio eius quam Augustus Caesar . . in senatu recitavit. Suet. Aug. 89: libros totos senatui recitavit, . . ut orationem Q. Metelli de prole augenda.

4. Cic. Brut. 35, 131: doctus etiam Graecis T. Albucius, vel potius paene Graecus. . . licet ex orationibus iudicare. fuit autem Athenis adolescens, perfectus Epicureus (comp. de d. nat. I 33, 93) evaserat. There Q. Scaevola met him a. 633 and made fun of him, a scene described by Lucilius in his satires; see Cic. de fin. I 3, 8 sq. or. 44, 149. A. 651 he was accused and sentenced on account of extortions, whereupon he returned to Athens and lived there quietly as a philosopher (Cic. Tusc. V 37, 108). A. Preuner in Pauly's Encyclop. I 1 p. 652, n. 1.

5. Cic. Brut. 33, 127: C. Galba, Servi (above 127, 4) . . filius, P. Crassi (above 129, 5) . . gener, . . rogatione Mamilia, Iugurthinae coniurationis invidia, cum pro sese ipse dixisset, oppressus est (a. 644). exstat eius peroratio, qui epilogus dicitur; qui tanto in honore pueris nobis erat ut eum etiam ediscremus.

6. Cic. Brut. 34, 129: C. (Flavius) Fimbria . . bonus auctor in senatu. idem tolerabilis patronus nec rudis in iure civili, et cum virtute tum etiam ipso orationis genere liber. cuius orationes pueri legebamus, quas iam reperire vix possumus. Comp. de or. II 22, 91.

7. As orators of the same period, though without detailed mention of published speeches, Cicero speaks of P. Scipio and L. Bestia (Brut. 128), C. Licinius Nerva (ib. 129), C. Sextius Calvinus, M. Brutus and L. Caesulenus (ib. 130), M. Silanus, M. Aurelius Scaurus, A. Postumius Albinus, the flamen Albinus, Q. Caepio (ib. 135), C. and L. Memmii, Sp. Thorius, M. Marcellus and his adopted son P. Lentulus (ib. 136), L. Cotta (ib. 137); also L. Apuleius Saturninus (seditiosorum omnium post Gracchus eloquentissimus, ib. 62, 224), C. Servilius Glaucia (ib.).

136. A manysided literary activity was in this period shown by the two optimates P. Rutilius Rufus (Cons. 649) and Q. Lutatius Catulus (Cons. 652): the noble Rufus was an adherent of Stoic philosophy, an orator, an author on questions of law, and of historical works, especially of an autobiography. Catulus, besides his political and military activity, wrote erotic epigrams, an autobiography and other historical works.

1. P. Rutilius Rufus, born c. 596 (see Cic. Brut. 22, 85 and Appian. Hisp. 88), grown up in the circles of Africanus minor, under whom he (like Asellio, above 132) had served in the Numantine war (a. 620 sq.) as trib. mil. (App. Hisp. 88, cf. Cic. de rep. I 11, 17). As praetor (the year unknown) he was the author of the actio (Gai. inst. IV 35) or constitutio (fragm. Val. 1) Rutiliana, and the Edictum on the rights of patrons (Dig. XXXVIII 2, 1, 1) and previously perhaps of the lex Rutilia on the rufuli (Fest. p. 261 M.). Cons. 649 = 105, later (a. 662?) in return for his rigorous probity he was sentenced by the knights after a haughty Socrates-like defence and went into exile to Smyrna, where he received the citizenship (Cic. p. Balb. 11, 28. Tac. A. IV 43) and was alive as late as 676 (Cic. Brut. 22, 85, cf. de rep. I 8, 13 and de d. nat. III 32, 80), there too he seems to have died, see A. L'Oisel, vie de P. R. R., jurisconsulte stoicien, in his 'divers opuscules' (Paris 1652. 4.) p. 161 sqq. and in Meermann's Thesaur. iur. I p. 359 sqq. Majansius Comment. II p. 1 sqq. A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 1 p. 586 sq. n. 7. Löwe, P. Rutilii Rufi vita narrata, Züllichau 1853. 4. Ph. E. Huschke, Ztschfr. für Civilr. N. F. XIV (1856) p. 1—21.

2. Vellej. II 13, 2: P. Rutilium, virum non saeculi sui, sed omnis aevi optimum. See also Capitol. Gordian. 5, 5. Ammian. XXX 4. Cic. Brut. 30, 113: Rutilius in quodam tristi et severo genere dicendi versatus est. . . multa opera multaque industria Rutilius fuit; quae erat propterea gratior quod idem magnum munus de iure respondendi sustinebat. (114) sunt eius orationes ieiunae, multa praeclara de iure; doctus vir et graecis litteris eruditus, Panaeti auditor, prope perfectus in stoicis. Suet. Aug. 89: libros totos . . recitavit . . ut orationem . . Rutili de modo aedificiorum. Diomed. I p. 372 P. = 376, 4 K.: P. Rutilius . . pro L. Cesutio ad populum. H. Meyer, oratt. p. 263 sqq. ed. II. His legal knowledge he owed to P. Scaevola (above 129, 4); see Cic. off. II 13, 47, cf. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 40. From his juridical writings some fragments are quoted in the Digest, on the authority of Ulpian, but without further details; see Dig. VII 8, 10, 3. XXXIII 9, 3, 9 (cf. Gell. IV 1, 22). XLIII 27, 1, 2. S. W. Zimmern, History of Roman private law I 1 p. 280—282. Macrobius' notice (Sat. I 16, 34 Rutilius scribit etc.) about nundinae might be derived, through the medium of a work of Varro's, from a juridical work of Rutilius (or from his autobiography).

3. P. Rutilius Rufus de vita sua is quoted by Charisius (p. 120, 17. 125, 11. 130, 18. 139, 18. 146, 35. 195, 16 K.) and Diomedes (p. 373, 13.

376, 3 K.). The first repeats (p. 120. 139) from his fifth book. Autobiographical relations are also indicated by App. Hisp. 88: *Ῥουτίλιον Ῥοῦφον, συγγραφέα τῶνδε τῶν ἔργων* (before Numantia) *τότε χιλιαρχοῦντα, ἐκέλευσε* etc. (hence Suidas s. v. *Ῥουτίλιος*), and Isidor's notice (Orig. XX 11, 4) from Rutilius Rufus de vita sua agrees also with App. Hisp. 85. From the same work may be derived Plut. Mar. 28, *ὡς δὲ Ῥουτίλιος ἱστορεῖ, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα φιλαλήθης ἀνὴρ καὶ χρηστός, ἰδίᾳ δὲ τῷ Μαρίῳ προσκεκρουκώς*, and Plut. Pompei. 37 *ὁ Ῥουτίλιος ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις*. But the embassy a. 599 (aiunt Rutilius et Polybius, Gell. VI (VII) 14, 10) occured in his earliest childhood, and the death of Scipio the Elder (Scipionem et Polybius et Rutilius hoc anno mortuum scribunt, Liv. XXXIX 52, 1) was certainly before his birth, though it is not impossible that both these events were somewhere mentioned incidentally in his autobiography. At all events, side by side with the Latin version we must assume one in Greek, in which the personal tone was perhaps enlarged to an historical one (in Asellio's manner), the general title *Ἱστορίαι* being also preferred. Cf. Athen. IV 66 p. 168 E.: *Ῥουτιλίῳ τῷ τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκδεδωκότι τῇ Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ*. VI 108 p. 274 C.: *Ῥουτίλιος Ῥοῦφος ὁ τὴν πάτριον ἱστορίαν γεγραφώς*. XII 61 p. 543 B.: *διαβόητος ἦν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Σίττιος ἐπὶ τρυφῇ . ., ὥς φησι Ῥουτίλιος*, an observation probably made on account of Rutilius' accuser Apicius (cf. ib. p. 168 E.). Both works seem to have been composed at Smyrna; cf. Oros. V 17 extr.: Smyrnam commigrans litterarum studiis intentus consenuit. In general see Krause hist. p. 227—231. C. L. Roth p. 328—330. Suringar de rom. autobiogr. p. 8 sqq. Gerlach, Historians p. 77—79. Nissen, Critical Investig. (1863) p. 41—43.

4. Q. Lutatius Catulus, Cons. 652 = 102, the victor of Vercellae 653, † 667, thus preventing an execution by Marius. Cic. Brut. 35, 132, non antiquo illo more, sed hoc nostro . . eruditus (cf. de or. II 7, 28). multae litterae, summa non vitae solum atque naturae sed orationis etiam comitas, incorrupta quaedam latini sermonis integritas (comp. 74, 259. de or. III 8, 29. off. I 37, 133. Quintil. XI 3, 35). quae perspici cum ex orationibus eius potest tum facillume ex eo libro quem de consulatu et de rebus gestis suis conscriptum molli et xenophonteo genere sermonis misit ad A. Furium poetam, familiarem suum. Plut. Mar. 25 *ὅμοια δὲ καὶ τὸν Κάτλον αὐτὸν ἀπολογεῖσθαι . . ἱστοροῦσι* (Sulla? H. Peter, Plutarch's sources, p. 102), cf. 26 *ὡς τὸν Κάτλον αὐτὸν ἱστορεῖν λέγουσι*, and 27 *τὰ οὖν λάφυρα . . ἀνενεχθῆναι λέγουσιν*. He also wrote a Communis historia in at least four books (Philargyr. on Virg. Ge. IV 564) which from the fragments (see C. L. Roth, hist. p. 332 sq.) would seem to have had an Euhemeristic tendency, the title probably (Al. Riese, Rh. Mus. XVIII p. 448—450) denoting temporal history, as opposed to historia sacra. Hence no doubt the notices on the lacus Curtius (Cornelius et Lutatius scribunt etc. Varro L. L. V 150) and on the year in which Rome was founded, (Nepoti et Lutatio, Solin. Polyh. 2). A work of this kind is quite in harmony with the sceptical position assumed by Catulus in philosophy, where he adhered

to the New Academy: Cic. Acad. II 48, 148. On Catulus' epigrams see above 123, 4. In general L. O. Bröcker in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1246 sq. n. 8. Gerlach, historians p. 79 sq.

137. This period possesses a scholar in the Roman knight L. Aelius Praeconinus Stilo of Lanuvium. He adhered to Stoicism and was the first to give solid instruction to friends in Latin literature and eloquence, creating a scientific basis for the investigation of the Latin language and antiquity, by going back to the oldest documents and commenting on them. The first Roman philologer, he bequeathed the purpose and results of his investigations to his pupil Varro. At the same time scholars of Greek origin pursued the same studies, e. g. Laelius Archelaus and Vettius Philocomus.

1. Suet. de gramm. 2 (p. 101 sq. Rffsch.): instruxerunt auxeruntque ab omni parte grammaticam L. Aelius Lanuvinus generque Aelii Ser. Clodius, uterque eques rom. multique ac varii et in doctrina et in rep. usus. (3) Aelius cognomine duplici fuit; nam et Praeconinus, quod pater eius praeconium fecerat, vocabatur, et Stilo, quod orationes nobilissimo cuique scribere solebat; tantus optimatium fautor ut Metellum Numidicum (above 135, 3) in exsilium comitatus sit (a. 654). Cic. Brut. 56, 205: L. Aelius . . fuit vir egregius et eques rom. cum primis honestus, idemque eruditissimus et graecis litteris et latinis antiquitatisque nostrae et in inventis rebus et in actis scriptorumque veterum litterate peritus. quam scientiam Varro noster acceptam ab illo auctamque per sese . . pluribus et illustrioribus litteris explicavit. (206) Sed idem Aelius stoicus esse voluit, orator autem nec studuit umquam nec fuit; scribebat tamen orationes quas alii dicerent, ut (205: Cottae pro se lege Varia, a. 663), Q. Metello *F., ut Q. Caepioni (cf. ib. 169), ut Pompeio Rufo. . . (207) his scriptis etiam ipse interfui, cum essem apud Aelium adulescens eumque audire perstudiose solerem. Cornific. ad Herenn. IV 12, 18: Lucilius . . in priore libro: Has res ad te scriptas, Luci, misimus, Aeli. Varro ap. Gell. N. A. I 18, 2: L. Aelius noster, litteris ornatissimus memoria nostra, and L. L. VII 2, homo in primis in litteris latinis exercitatus. Comp. also Gell. X 21, 2, qui doctissimus eorum temporum fuerat, L. Aelius Stilo. Plin. N. H. XXXIII 1, 7 (L. Aelii Stilonis, Praeconini ob id cognominati). XXXVII 1, 4 (Stilo Praeconinus). More than once the mss. give Laelius instead of L. Aelius, e. g. Cic. or. 69, 230 (L. Caelius Antipater in prooemio belli punici . . . hanc a Laelio, ad quem scripsit, . . veniam petit, see above 132, 4) ad Fam. IX 15, 2. Acad. post. I 2, 8. (de or. I 62, 265. Plin. N. H. XIV 13, 15?). As it now appears that L. Aelius was a friend of Lucilius and Cicero his pupil, he must have been born c. 610 and seems to have reached an old age. See Ritschl Parerga p. 239.

2. On his literary activity. Aeliana studia (antiquitatis romanae), Cic. de or. I 43, 193? cf. Acad. post. I 2. 8. Varro R. R. III 12. L. L.

V 66. 101. VI 7. Gell. N. A. XII 4, 5 appeal to oral opinions. His writings: Aelii . . interpretationem carminum Saliorum videbis et exiliter (?) expeditam et praeterita obscura multa, Varro L. L. VII 2. Comp. Fest. v. manuos, molucrum, pescia. Corssen, Orig. poes. rom. p. 48 sqq. and above 54, 2. — His commentary on the 12 tables: Cic. Legg. II 23, 59. Fest. v. sonticus morbus. R. Schöll, Legg. XII tabb. reliqq. p. 30 is of opinion that we should always understand Stilo where Aelius alone is mentioned. — Commentarium de proloquiis L. Aelii, docti hominis, qui magister Varronis fuit, . . legimus. sed in eo nihil edocenter neque ad instituendum explanate scriptum est, fecisseque videtur eum librum Aelius sui magis admonendi quam aliorum docendi gratia, Gell. N. A. XVI 8, 2 sq. — On the subject of the criticism and interpretation of the old Latin poets, he was an admirer of Plautus, Quintil. X 1, 99. Indices Aelii (among others) super his fabulis (Plauti) quae dicuntur ambiguae, Gell. III 3, 1 and ib. 12: homo eruditissimus L. Aelius XXV (comoedias) eius (Plauti) esse solas existimavit. See above 84, 4. 88, 4. Numerous etymological (in quo . . erravit aliquotiens, Varro ap. Gell. I 18, 2) and grammatical observations of Stilo's are collected in van Heusde's work p. 64—81.

3. Principal work: Disquisitio de L. Aelio Stilone, Ciceronis in rhetoricis magistro, Rhetoricorum ad Herenn. ut videtur auctore (the latter is not proved). Inserta sunt Aelii Stilonis et Servii Claudii fragmenta. Scripsit J. A. C. van Heusde. Traj. ad Rhen. 1839. VIII and 109 pp. See Mommsen, H. of Rome II[3] p. 426. 457.

4. Sueton. gramm. 2 (cf. above 133, 3): ut Laelius Archelaus Vettiusque Philocomus Lucili saturas familiaribus suis (pronuntiabant), quas legisse se apud Archelaum Pompeius Lenaeus, apud Philocomum Valerius Cato praedicant. As in the lines directly following this humble degree of learned employment is contrasted with the higher, represented by Stilo (instruxerunt etc., above n. 1) and as on the other hand the pupils of these two (Lenaeus and Cato) belong to the time of Cicero, Archelaus and Philocomus are probably to be considered as contemporaries of Stilo, perhaps 645—675.

138. The twenty years 650—670 V. C. again contain violent civil struggles, partly with the allies who in the Marsian war obtained for themselves complete equality with the Romans, partly between the revived popular party and the nobility fighting for their privileges and at length victorious through Sulla. The great activity stirred up by these struggles in the national domains of intellectual activity, in rhetoric and jurisprudence, produced splendid results. Eloquence now became a matter of instruction and was also taught by natives. Historical writing was in the hands of the junior Annalists, some showing themselves influenced by rhetoric, others swayed

by party views. In poetry also there was much activity; the Atellan farce was introduced into literature by Pomponius and Novius; Cn. Matius composed mimiambi and translated the Iliad; Laevius (if we place him so late as this) began to imitate the varied forms of Greek metres. This period possessed an epic poet in A. Furius, the successor of Hostius (bellum istricum), and a tragic poet in L. Julius Caesar Strabo. In the same period are born Cicero (648) and Caesar (654).

1. Latini rhetores at Rome, see above 36, 8.

2. On the later Annalists see above § 32.

3. On Pomponius and Novius see above 125.

4. Varro L. L. VII 95: apud Matium: Corpora Graiorum maerebat mandier igni. Cf. ib. 96. Gellius who never mentions Matius without complimenting him as doctus vir, homo impense doctus, vir eruditus etc., quotes Cn. Matium . . in secundo Iliadis (VII 6, 5) and Cn. Matius in Iliadis XXI (IX 14, 14, cf. 15). See also Charis. p. 117, 13. 345, 8 K. Priscian. VII p. 334, 19 sq. Htz.: Cn. Matius in Iliade: celerissimus advolat Hector. No book higher than XXI being quoted of Matius, but Priscian IV p. 478, 12 sq. mentioning Ninnius Crassus in XXIV Iliados, the latter might be supposed to have finished the translation left incomplete by Matius; but Non. p. 475, 14 has Crassus lib. XVI Iliados. The mimiambi were farcical iambi (in the style of the mimi) a modification of iambic poetry, not of mimi. We should not suppose them to have been acted on the stage. The metre (senarii claudi) corresponds to the farcical character of the subject. Lines from Cn. Matius' mimiambi are quoted by Gell. X 24, 10 (cf. Macrob. I 4, 24). XV 25, 1 sq. cf. Non. Marcell. p. 106, 25. 167, 17). XX 9, 2 sq. See Prisc. VI p. 274, 25 sq. Htz. Macrob. III 20, 5. Terent. Maur. p. 2437 P. Ziegler, de mimis p. 65 sqq. Wernsdorf, poett. latt. min. IV p. 568 sqq. Meyer, Anthol. lat. Ep. 120.

5. Ausonius says in the epilogue to his cento nuptialis in justification of it: quid antiquissimi poetae Laevii Erotopaegnion libros loquar? Gell. XIX 9, 7 (above 26, 1) in his list of Roman erotic poets: Laevius . . Hortensius . . Cinna . . Memmius. ib. II 24, 8 huius legis (the Licinia sumptuaria, carried before the consulship of Licinius, i. e. before 657 V. C., see W. Rein in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 1509) Laevius poeta meminit in Erotopaegniis. (ib. 10: Lucilius quoque legis istius meminit.) Hence arises the possibility of placing L. as early as the time of Lucilius and the erotic epigrammatists (above 123), which would also harmonize with his style and diction (see esp. Gellius XIX 7, 2 sqq.). Mommsen, H. of R. III³ p. 579 calls him Laevinus; but see Gell. XIX 7, 2 (in Laeviano carmine) and 12 (verborum Laevianorum). His name is often confounded with Livius, Naevius, Laelius (e. g. Apul. apol. 30). Porphyr. on Hor. O. III 1, 2 p. 245, cf. 241 H.: Romanis utique non prius audita, quamvis Laevius lyrica ante Horatium scripserit, sed videntur

illa non Graecorum lege ad lyricum characterem exacta. The erotic character of Laevius' poems, widely different from his own, seems to have justified Horace in entirely neglecting this predecessor. The highest number of books: Laevius Ἐρωτοπαιγνίων VI ap. Charis. II p. 183 P. = 204, 16 K. Cf. Charis. IV p. 288, 5 sq. K.: in pterygio Phoenicis Laevii novissimae odes Erotopaegnion. Possibly we have subdivisions of this general title (Weichert p. 40, cf. 57) in the citations Laevius in Adone (Prisc. p. 269, 6 Htz.), in Ione (ib. p. 281, 3), in Protesilaodamia (Gell. XII 10, 5. Nonius p. 116. 209. Prisc. p. 242, 13; cf. in Protesilao Prisc. p. 484, 9; in Laudamia, p. 496, 27), in Sirenocirca (Prisc. p. 302, 1. Non. p. 120), in Polymetris (Prisc. p. 258, 12), in Centauris (Fest. p. 206 M.), Alcestis (Gell. XIX 7, 2). To the same category seem to belong the corrupt quotations Vaeius Pullis or Pulis in Non. p. 72. 139. 513. Laevius' Cypria Ilias was no doubt Independent (Charis. I p. 118 P. = 145, 21 K.: Laevius Cypriae Iliadis libro I; cf. Prisc. X p. 881 P. = 502, 24: nevius in Iliadis secundo, where M. Hertz has Ninnius in his text) in hexameters, the other fragments of Laevius being in lyrical metres, iambic dimeters, trochees, phalaecian metre, ionici carelessly treated and mixed. The materials are collected by A. Weichert, de Laevio poeta, in the poett. latt. vitae etc. p. 31—88. Also Fr. Wüllner, de Laevio poeta, Münster 1829, 4. and in the General Gazette for Schools, 1830. II p. 1259 sqq. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 732. L. Müller, de re metr. p. 75—77. On the fragments see also M. Haupt, Observ. critt. p. 43 sq. J. Becker, Philol. VI p. 362—365.

6. Hostius' bellum istricum seems to have consisted of at least 3 books; cf. Macrob. VI 3, 6 and 5, 8 (libro II belli histrici). Serv. Aen. XII 121 (belli histrici primo). Comp. Festus v. scaevam and tuesca, p. 325. 356 M. His treatment of this comparatively unimportant war (a. 576 sqq.) cannot be due to any other motive than the intention of continuing Ennius' annals. If, however, we understand (with Bergk, Jahn's Jahrb. 83 p. 322) this title of the war of a. 625, this explanation cannot be assumed. The view of Hostius being the earliest continuator of Ennius, even earlier than L. Attius and those named § 123, though somewhat later than those enumerated § 103, is also supported by the mention of him in Servius l. l. after Ennius and before Asellio, in Macrob. VI 5, 8 after Naevius, nor is it contradicted by the character of the fragments of the epic poem (sient, the prosody of Dia Minerva, semol autem tu, invictus Apollo, if quite certain). That date would become quite certain if in Priscian VI p. 719 P. = 270, 8 sq. Htz. (vetustissimi etiam 'hoc pecu' unde 'haec pecua' plurale, dicebant. Hostilius in I annali: saepe greges pecuum ex hibernis pastilus pulsae) the change of the ms. reading Hostilius into Hostius were sufficiently established. This would finally agree with Propert. III 20, 8 splendidaque a docto fama refulget avo, supposing of course that Cynthia (who is addressed there) was really named Hostia and was of Roman origin. See in general A. Weichert, poett. lat. vit. p. 3—18.

7. On A. Furius see 123, 3; on Caesar Strabo below 140, 3.

139. The principal orators of this period are M. Antonius (Cons. 655) and L. Licinius Crassus (Cons. 659); the first a self-taught man who owed everything to his excellent memory, natural vivacity and quick imagination and whose chief merit lay in his brilliant delivery; Crassus a man of acute intellect, and juridical training, hence as an orator less taking than Antonius, but persuasive through his lucid explanations, and winning through merry wit and elegant language.

1. M. Antonius C. f. Orator, born 611, praetor 650, Consul 655 = 99, Censor 657, killed by the partisans of Marius 667; see E. J. G. Bruner, de M. Antonio et L. Crasso oratoribus rom., Helsingfors 1853. 4. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. I 1 p. 1169—1171, n. 6. His style is described (besides de oratore, where he and Crassus are the two principal speakers) esp. Cic. Brut. 37, 139—38, 142 (cf. 57, 207. 59, 215. 88, 301. 89, 304), e. g. erat memoria summa, nulla meditationis suspicio. . . verba ipsa non illa quidem elegantissimo sermone. . . sed tamen in verbis et eligendis . . et collocandis . . nihil non ad rationem et tamquam ad artem dirigebat; verum multo magis hoc idem in sententiarum ornamentis et conformationibus. . . actio singularis. . . gestus erat . . cum sententiis congruens. . . vox permanens, verum subrauca natura. sed hoc vitium . . in bonum convertebat. habebat enim flebile quiddam in questionibus aptumque cum ad fidem faciendam tum ad misericordiam commovendam. As the general result Cic. Tusc. V 19, 55 states: omnium eloquentissimus quos ego viderim. Cf. de or. I 38, 172: Antonii incredibilis quaedam . . vis ingenii videtur, etiamsi scientia iuris nudata sit, posse se facile ceteris armis prudentiae tueri.

2. M. Antonius purposely did not publish his speeches, of which that for M'. Aquilius (a. 656) seems to have been the most famous, not so much (though he himself used to allege this as his reason) on account of lawyerlike shrewdness (above 36, 4), as rather from the knowledge that they could not possibly produce the same affect when read as when heard. By mere chance, he published a small work de ratione dicendi of not much significance; see Cic. orat. 5, 18. Brut. 44, 163. Quintil. III 1, 19 (hoc solum opus eius, atque id ipsum imperfectum, manet). 6, 45. A quotation from it is given by Cic. de or. I 21, 94. orat. 5, 18. Quintil. VIII prooem. 13. XII 1, 21. Plin. Ep. V 20, 5. The notices on the speeches of Antonius see in H. Meyer oratorum fragm. p. 280—291 ed. II.

3. L. Licinius L. f. Crassus, born 614 (Cic. Brut. 43, 161), made his début as orator a. 635 (annos natus XXI, Cic. de or. III 20, 74; wrongly XIX in Tac. dial. 34; see Rh. Mus. XIX p. 575—577), 636 leader of the colony to Narbo Martius, Cons. 659, Censor 662, in which office he took part in the expulsion of the rhetores latini (above 36, 8. Cic. de or. III 24, 93 sq. Tac. dial. 35), † 663. See A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1058—1063, n. 18. The description given of Crassus

by Cicero is less trustworthy, owing to Cicero's evident desire to identify himself with him, just as he also imitated him in the comedy of his Cilician triumph. This identification is pushed so far as to attribute to Crassus (II 33, 142, cf. I 42, 190 sq.) even the intention of writing a work de iure civili in artem redigundo. In the same manner I 34, 153 sq. those exercises in style are attributed to him which Cicero himself went through in his youth (cf. Quintil. X 5, 2). Especially the importance attached to the necessity of varied culture in an orator (e. g. I 34, 156 sqq.) is due to this motive, as in reality we have no reason for assuming that Crassus in this respect differed materially from Antonius and other noblemen of his time. The description in Brut. 38, 143—39, 145. 40, 148. 43, 158—44, 165 is much more probable. E. g. 143: erat summa gravitas, erat cum gravitate iunctus facetiarum et urbanitatis . . lepos; latine loquendi accurata et sine molestia diligens elegantia; in disserendo mira explicatio; cum de iure civili, cum de aequo et bono disputaretur, argumentorum et similitudinum copia. 145: ut eloquentium iurisperitissimus Crassus, iurisperitorum eloquentissimus Scaevola (below 141, 1 sq.) putaretur. 158: vehemens et interdum irata et plena iusti doloris oratio . . idem et perornatus et perbrevis. 159: iam in altercando invenit parem neminem. versatus est in omni fere genere causarum. 162: quin etiam comprehensio et ambitus ille verborum (his sentences) . . erat apud illum contractus et brevis, et in membra quaedam, quae κῶλα Graeci vocant, dispertiebat orationem libentius (cf. orat. 66, 223. Tac. dial. 18: Graccho politior et ornatior Crassus. 26: C. Gracchi impetum aut L. Crassi maturitatem. Macrob. Sat. V 1, 16 sq.: sunt stili duo . . unus est maturus et gravis, qualis Crasso adsignatur . . alter huic contrarius, ardens et erectus et infensus, quali est usus Antonius.

4. Published speeches. Cic. orat. 38, 132: Crassi perpauca sunt, nec ea iudiciorum. Brut. 43, 160: orationis eius (for the Vestal virgin Licinia, a. 641) scriptas quasdam partes reliquit. . . exstat in eam legem (de colonia Narbonem deducenda) . . oratio. 161: haec Crassi (pro lege Servilia) cum edita oratio est (a. 648), . . XXXIV tum habebat annos. 44, 162: est etiam L. Crassi in consulatu (a. 659) pro Q. Caepione . . non brevis ut laudatio, ut oratio autem brevis. postrema censoris oratio. in his omnibus inest quidam sine ullo fuco veritatis color. 163: vellem plura Crasso libuisset scribere. 164: multa in illa oratione (pro lege Servilia) . . dicta sunt, plura etiam dicta quam scripta, quod ex quibusdam capitibus expositis nec explicatis intellegi potest, ipsa illa censoria contra Cn. Domitium collegam non est oratio, sed quasi capita rerum et orationis commentarium paulo plenius. See above 36, 7. The simplicity of his style was not acceptable to later rhetoricians. Only through Cicero have a few passages from his speeches been preserved; see H. Meyer orat. fragm. p. 291—327 ed. II. These specimens exhibit frequent use of anaphora and rhetorical questions and as they are quoted on account of their vivacity, give an idea of Crassus' eloquence from this side alone.

140. In addition to these two eminent orators this period possessed good speakers in the jurist Q. Scaevola (Cons. 659) and L. Marcius Philippus (Cons. 663); among the younger men the most eminent orators were L. Julius Caesar Strabo, who also wrote tragedies, C. Aurelius Cotta (Cons. 679) and P. Sulpicius Rufus, besides whom we should also mention C. Scribonius Curio (Cons. 658).

1. For Scaevola, see below 141, 1.

2. L. Marcius Philippus, born c. 610 V. C., Cons. 663, Censor, 668, died after 677; see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1538—1540, n. 4. Cic. Brut. 47, 173: duobus summis, Crasso et Antonio, L. Philippus proxumus accedebat, sed longo intervallo tamen proxumus. . . erat in Philippo . . summa libertas in oratione, multae facetiae; . . erat . . graecis doctrinis institutus, in altercando cum aliquo aculeo et maledicto facetus. Cf. 45, 166: summa nobilitate hominem, . . summa etiam eloquentia. As he used to improvise (Cic. de or. II 78, 316) we know only a few dicta of his quoted from mere recollection, see Cic. off. II 21, 73. de or. III 1, 2. Sallust (Hist. I) makes him pronounce a speech against Lepidus (a. 676 sq.)

3. C. Iulius L. f. Caesar Strabo (C. I. lat. I p. 278, IV; also Sesquiculus and Vopiscus, Mar. Vict. de orthogr. I p. 2456. Varro R. R. I 7, 10. Cic. Phil. XI 5, 11), aed. cur. (a. 664 = 90; Cic. Brut. 89, 305. Ascon in Scaur. p. 24 Or.), Q., tr. mil. bis, Xvir agr. dand. adtr., iud., pontif. (according to the elogium C. I. lat. l. l.), a. 667 killed by the partisans of Marius with his elder brother Lucius (Cons. 664). Cic. Brut. 48, 177: festivitate et facetiis C. Iulius L. f. et superioribus et aequalibus suis omnibus praestitit, oratorque fuit minume ille quidem vehemens, sed nemo umquam urbanitate, nemo lepore, nemo suavitate conditior (cf. de or. II 23, 98. off. I 37, 133. Tusc. V 19, 55). sunt eius aliquot orationes, ex quibus, sicut ex eiusdem tragoediis, lenitas eius sine nervis perspici potest. de or. III 8, 30: novam quandam rationem attulit orationis. . . res . . tragicas paene comice, tristes remisse, severas hilare, forenses scenica prope venustate tractavit. Ascon. on Cic. p. Scaur. p. 24 Or.: idem inter primos temporis sui oratores et tragicus poeta bonus admodum habitus est. huius sunt enim tragoediae, quae inscribuntur Iuli. Of the latter we know the titles Adrastus, Teuthras, Tecmessa; Welcker, Greek trag. p. 1398—1400. Ribbeck tragg. p. 194. See above 119, 3. The fragments of his speeches in Meyer p. 330 sqq. ed. II. Cf. C. Krafft in Pauly's Encyclop. IV. p. 426, n. 8.

4. C. Aurelius M. f. Cotta, born c. 630 (Cic. Brut. 88, 301), 663—672 in exile, Cons. 679, † 680. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. I 2, p. 2164 sq. n. 10. Cic. Brut. 49, 182 sq.: aetate inferiores paulo quam Iulius, sed aequales propemodum fuerunt C. Cotta, P. Sulpicius, Q. Varius, Cn. Pomponius (cf. ib. 62, 221. 90, 308; on the other hand see

de or. III 13, 50), C. Curio (n. 6), C. Carbo (praetor 669, † 672; Brut. 62, 221), L. Fufius (Brut. 222), M. Drusus (ib.), P. Antistius (ib. 226 sq.). . . ex his Cotta et Sulpicius cum meo iudicio tum omnium facile primas tulerunt. See de or. I 8, 30. orat. 56, 204. Ascon. in Cornel. p. 66 Or. Cic. Brut. 55, 202: inveniebat acute Cotta, dicebat pure ac solute. . . nihil erat in eius oratione nisi sincerum, nihil nisi siccum atque sanum. Cf. 92, 317 (remissus et lenis et propriis verbis comprehendens solute et facile sententiam), orat. 30, 106. de or. II 23, 98. III 8, 31. His interest in philosophy and adherence to the New Academy (and Antiochus) was in agreement with this methodical manner; see Cic. de deor. nat. I 7, 16. II 1, 1. de divin. I 5, 8. He did not publish any speeches (orat. 38, 132). Cottae pro se lege Varia quae inscribitur, eam L. Aelius (above 137, 1) scripsit Cottae rogatu, Brut. 56, 205: see 207: Cottam miror, summum ipsum oratorem minumeque ineptum, Aelianas levis oratiunculas voluisse existumari suas. Sallust (Hist.) attributed to him an oratio ad populum rom. The passages relating to him and his speeches are collected by Meyer, oratt. p. 339—343 ed. II.

5. P. Sulpicius Rufus, a contemporary of the preceding, born c. 633, proscribed and killed by the party of Sulla as tr. pl. a. 666; see A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. VI 2 p. 1495 sq. n. 35. Cic. Brut. 55, 203: fuit Sulpicius vel maxime omnium quos quidem ego audiverim grandis et, ut ita dicam, tragicus orator, vox cum magna tum suavis et splendida; gestus et motus corporis venustus; . . incitata et volubilis, nec ea redundans tamen et circumfluens oratio. Crassum hic volebat imitari, Cotta malebat Antonium (in accordance with Cicero's description of the rhetorical style of both one might feel tempted to reverse this); sed ab hoc vis aberat Antoni, Crassi ab illo lepos. Cf. de or. I 29, 131. II 21, 88. 23, 96. III 8, 31. de harusp. resp. 19, 41. Brut. 56, 205 (cf. orat. 38, 132): Sulpici orationes quae feruntur, eas post mortem eius scripsisse P. Canutius putatur. ipsius Sulpici nulla oratio est, saepeque ex eo audivi cum se scribere neque consuesse neque posse diceret.

6. Cic. Brut. 57, 207: his duobus (Cotta and Sulpicius) eiusdem aetatis annumerabatur nemo tertius, sed mihi placebat (Cn.) Pomponius (see n. 4) maxume, vel dicam, minume displicebat. 58, 210: erant tamen quibus videretur illius aetatis tertius Curio, quia splendidioribus fortasse verbis utebatur et quia latine non pessime loquebatur, usu, credo, aliquo domestico. nam litterarum admodum nihil sciebat. Cf. 59, 213. This C. Scribonius was tr. pl. 664, Cons. 678, and died 701; see A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. VI 1 p. 879 sq. n. 11. He was a bitter enemy of Caesar's (Suet. Caes. 9. 49. 50. 52) und composed against him a political pamphlet in the form of a dialogue; see Cic. Brut. 60, 218 sq. He was also pontifex maximus; hence Varro's Logistoricus Curio de cultu deorum.

7. Besides those already named Cicero in his Brutus mentions a great number of those who were public speakers (qui tantum in dicentium numero, non in oratorum, fuerunt, see 47, 176) or only clamatores

(49, 182). He might have quoted nearly all those whose names appeared in the lists of magistracy, but he is somewhat careless as to chronological order, and only pours out his store of names, adding little to characterise them, e. g. 165 sq. 168 sq. 174 sq. 178–180. Those deserve most to be mentioned who in this period apud socios et Latinos oratores habiti sunt (46, 169), viz. Q. Vettius Vettianus e Marsis, Q. and D. Valerii Sorani, the sons of the one mentioned above 124, 1; C. Rusticelius Bononiensis, and especially omnium eloquentissimus extra hanc urbem T. Betutius Barrus Asculanus, cuius sunt aliquot orationes Asculi habitae et illa Romae contra Caepionem nobilis sane, cui orationi Caepionis ore respondit Aelius (above 137, 1), Brut. 46, 169. Ib. 89, 304 are styled oratores non illi quidem principes L. Memmius (cf. ib. 36, 136. 70, 247) et Q. Pompeius, sed oratores tamen. The latter, Q. Pompeius Rufus (Cons. 666), etiam ipse scripsit eas (orationes) quibus pro se est usus, sed non sine Aelio (ib. 56, 206).

141. Next to eloquence, jurisprudence, a science in direct connexion with it, showed most life in this time. It was brilliantly represented by the pontifex Q. Scaevola (Cons. 659), one of the most pleasing Roman characters, accurate, varied and liberal, the ideal of a lawyer, to which vocation he devoted his life, as a solicitor, adviser, teacher and writer; he was the first to undertake a systematical treatise on jurisprudence, which was used and imitated by all subsequent writers; he was free from pedantry, eloquent, and of unyielding honour and unstained probity. Independently of his writings, his memory was kept alive by his numerous pupils, among whom Lucilius Balbus and Aquilius Gallus were the most important. Side by side with him Sex. Pompeius, Aculeo, and Q. Cornelius Maximus were especially famous as jurists.

1. Q. Mucius P. f. (son of the one mentioned above 129, 4) P. n. Scaevola, friend of the orator L. Crassus (above 139, 3 sq.) and his colleague in all his offices, e. g. in the consulship 659, except the censorship, and in the tribuneship killed by the party of Marius a. 672; see S. W. Zimmern, History of Roman civil law I 1 p. 284–287. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. V p. 184–187, n. 11. From his uncle with the same name (above 134, 3) he was distinguished by the designation of pontifex maximus, e. g. Ascon. p. 67 Or.: significat Q. Mucium Scaevolam pontificem max. eundemque et oratorem et iurisconsultum. L. Crassus ap. Cic. de or. I 39, 180 styles him aequalis et collega meus, homo omnium et disciplina iuris civilis eruditissimus et ingenio prudentiaque acutissimus et oratione maxime limatus . . atque, ut ego soleo dicere, iuris peritorum eloquentissimus, eloquentium iuris peritissimus. His style was remarkable for perspicuity, elegance and

conciseness; see Cic. de or. I 53, 229. Brut. 39, 145. 40, 148. 44, 163 (Scaevolae dicendi elegantiam satis ex iis orationibus quas reliquit habemus cognitam). Just as in the passages where Scaevola alone is mentioned and in a way almost proverbial (e. g. Hor. Ep. II 2, 89), we are justified in fixing on him especially as the most famous person of that name, he might also be that Scaevola whom Quintil. XI 2, 38 mentions on account of his strong memory. His anxiety for a systematic description of the ius civile, especially his work *περὶ ὅρων* (n. 2 at the end) renders it probable that he adhered to the Stoa and that he was actually the doctissimus pontifex (maximus) Scaevola whose Stoic threefold division of the gods (poetical, philosophical and political gods) and other freethinking opinions on popular religion are quoted by Augustin de civ. dei IV 27 on Varro's authority; see E. Zeller, on the state of philosophy among the Romans (1866) p. 32—36, where, however, such opinions as these should not have been stated to be due to the safety of maintaining them, they being on the contrary due to the constant candour and firm character of Scaevola.

2. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 41: Q. Mucius, P. f., pontifex maximus, ius civile primus constituit, generatim in libros XVIII redigendo. See Gell. VI (VII) 15, 2: Q. Scaevola in librorum quos de iure civili composuit XVI°. "For the first time we meet here with a comprehensive, uniform and methodical system, in the place of the old interpretation of laws and casuistry, of legal opinions and prejudices." A. F. Rudorff, History of Roman law, v. I p. 161. It was based on the purely Roman idea of the right of freely disposing of one's possessions, by a last will and among the survivors (uti legassit super familia tutelave, ita ius esto, Dig. L 16, 120 comp. 122. Gell. IV 1, 17. Dig. XXXIII 9, 3 pr. XXXIV 2, 27 pr.), which was followed by the obligations arising from injuries and compacts (Gell. VI (VII) 15, 2. Dig. XVII 2, 30. XLVII 2, 76, 1), and by legal prosecution (Dig. XIX 5, 11); see Rudorff l. l. p. 161 sq. His work remained the basis of the legal works of the next period, in supplementing, developing and amending it. Ser. Sulpicius e. g. wrote Notata Mucii (Dig. XVII 2, 30 comp. Gell. IV 1, 20: in reprehensis Scaevolae capitibus. Gai. Inst. I 188. III 149), Laelius Felix Ad Q. Mucium (Gell. XV 27, 1. 4), Gaius (I 188) ex Q. Mucio, and Ser. Pomponius (after Hadrian, see Dig. VII 8, 22) Ad Q. Mucium lectionum libri XXXIX, the latter work being frequently made use of in the Digest instead of Q. Mucius himself; it should no doubt also be understood Dig. XL 1, 53 sq. (Zimmern l. l. p. 287, n. 28). Besides this great work, Scaevola wrote also a Compendium liber singularis *Ὅρων* (definitionum), four times quoted in the Digest (Dig. XLI 1, 64. XLIII 20, 8. L 16, 241. 17, 73; comp. XXXV 1, 7 pr. Muciana cautio), as the oldest work used there.

3. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 42: Mucii auditores fuerunt complures, sed praecipuae auctoritatis Aquilius Gallus, Balbus Lucilius, Sex. Papirius, G. Iuventius. . . omnes tamen hi a Ser. Sulpicio nominantur, alioquin per se eorum scripta non talia exstant ut ea omnes appetant;

denique nec versantur omnino scripta eorum inter manus hominum, sed Servius (iis) libros suos complevit. Of these Gallus (below 161, 1) certainly belongs to the Ciceronian period, Cicero himself having for some time attended the responsa of this Q. Scaevola (Lael. 1, 1). Sex. Papirius and G. Iuventius are not known from other passages, though in Cic. Brut. 48, 178 T. Iuventius is mentioned for dryness in speaking; while at the same time is attributed to him magna iuris civilis intellegentia. L. Lucilius Balbus, doctus et eruditus homo, thoughtful, but slow (Cic. Brut. 42, 154), was the former master of Ser. Sulpicius (below 161, 2).

4. Other jurists besides Scaevola were Antipater (above 132, 4), Q. Tubero (above 134, 2) and Rutilius Rufus (136, 2), also Q. Lucretius Vispillo (in privatis causis et acutus et iurisperitus, Cic. Brut. 48, 178) and Paulus (Pompon. l. l. 40; Cic. Lael. 27, 101 has Aulus) Virginius, then Volcatius, the teacher of A. Cascellius (Plin. N. H. VIII 40, 61), and probably also C. Sextius Calvinus (Cic. Brut. 34, 130), Pontidius (Cic. de or. II 68, 275), and M. Buculeius (ib. I 39, 179).

Sex. Pompeius, Cnei Pompei (Magni) patruus (Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2. 40); praestantissimum ingenium contulerat ad summam iuris civilis et ad perfectam geometriae et rerum stoicarum scientiam (Cic. Brut. 47, 175 comp. de or. I 15, 67. III 21, 78. off. I 6, 19).

The Roman knight C. (Visellius) Aculeo, the friend of the orator L. Crassus (Cic. de or. II 1, 2), according to Cic. de or. I 43, 191 ita tenens ius civile ut ei (except Q. Scaevola) nemo de iis qui peritissimi sunt anteponatur, and (Brut. 76, 264) bequeathing his legal knowledge to his son C. Visellius Varro.

Q. Cornelius Maximus, known only as the teacher of Trebatius Testa (below 189, 3), and Cic. ad Fam. VII 17, 3 (idem Q. Cornelio videbatur, cf. ib. 8, 2). See also Gai. Inst. I 136 (Maximus). Dig. XXXIII 7, 16, 1 (Cornelius).

142. Among the Annalists of this period, Cn. Aufidius wrote in Greek; Q. Claudius Quadrigarius possessed sufficient critical insight to commence his Roman history with the conflagration of the Gauls. Valerius Antias in his very extensive work is the most important immediate predecessor of Livy, though his exaggerations both in descriptions and numerical statements prominently represent the manner of the later Annalists.

1. Cn. Aufidius praetorius (whose praetorship probably falls c. 650) nobis (i. e. c. 660 V. C.) et in senatu sententiam dicebat nec amicis deliberantibus deerat et graecam scribebat historiam et videbat (Bentley vivebat) in litteris, Cic. Tusc. V 38, 112; cf. fin. V 19, 54: equidem e Cn. Aufidio praetorio, erudito homine oculis capto, saepe audiebam. He reached a very advanced age (Cic. p. dom. 13, 35). C. I. gr. 2349 b

(ὁπὸ Γναίου Ἀὐφιδίου Γναίου υἱοῦ ἀντιστρατήγου), from Adramyttion, more probably relates to his son (W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. I 2 p. 2128. n. 5). Of his graeca historia we posses no fragments; but there is no doubt that it treated of the history of Rome. W. Harless, de Fabiis et Aufidiis rerum rom. scriptoribus (Bonn 1853) p. 46—49.

2. Vellei. II 9, 6: aequalis Sisennae Rutilius (above 136, 2) Claudiusque Quadrigarius et Valerius Antias. The person of Claudius is unknown. He was, possibly, identical with the translator of Acilius. See above 116, 1. The title of his work fluctuates, as usual, between Annales, Historiae, Rerum romanarum libri. The highest quotation is Q. Claudius in XXIII annali, by Gellius X 13, 4. The fragments of the first book prove that it treated of the conquest of Rome by the Gauls; but the critical tendency indicated in this is not in harmony with the accounts of the great losses on the side of the adversaries given by Claudius in his descriptions of battles (Liv. XXXIII 10, 9. XXXVIII 23, 8). In harmony with analogous works, he seems to have carried his to his own period; book XIX treated of Sulla's conquest of the Piraeus (Gell. XV 1, 4 sqq.). As the third book contained the first Punic war, the treatment appears to have been very unequal; at first a mere summary of events, but gradually expanding as the writer approached his own time, embodying even speeches and letters (Gell. I 7, 9. III 8, 8). The account was lengthy even in details and often reflective (e. g. Gell. X 13, 4). The diction was archaic and therefore to the taste of the time of Fronto; see Fronto ap. Gell. XIII 29 (28), 2 and Epist. p. 114, 3 sq. N.: historiam scripsere .. Claudius lepide, Antias invenuste, Sisenna longingue. Gell. XV 1, 4: Q. Claudi, optumi et sincerissimi scriptoris; IX 13, 4: Q. Claudius .. purissime atque inlustrissime simplicique et incompta orationis antiquae suavitate descripsit. Cicero and Dionysius do not mention him; Livy quotes him ten times, always calling him Claudius and sometimes differing from him. The greater part of the fragments are found in Gellius; see the collection of them in Krause p. 249—266, Roth p. 339—351. H. Peter, M. Claudi Quadrigari annalium reliquiae. disposuit, rec., praefatus est. Frankfurt a. d. O. 1868. 33 pp. 4. On Claudius see also Giesebrecht, Prenzlau 1831. 4. Krause p. 243—249. Gerlach, Roman Historians p. 81—83. Kieserling, de rer. script. p. 43—46. Nissen, Critical Investigations p. 39—41.

3. Valerius Antias (probably descended from the L. Valerius Antias mentioned by Liv. XXIII 34, 9), the author of an historical work, sometimes Historiae (or Historia) in at least 75 books (book LXXV is quoted by Gellius VI (VII) 9, 17; book LXXIV by Priscian IX 53. p. 872 P. = 489, 6 Htz.), beginning with the oldest history of Rome (Gell. VII (VI) 7, 6; the second book treated of Numa, Macrob. Sat. I 13, 20. Arnob. adv. nat. V 1) and reaching as far as the time of Sulla (he having mentioned the heirs of the orator L. Crassus, who died a. 663, Plin. N. H. XXXIV 3, 14). Dionysius mentions him II 13 and I 7 (see above 32, 3) among the ἐπαινούμενοι of the Roman historians. We

know him, however, chiefly through Livy who mentions him more frequently than any other of his predecessors (in 35 places in the existing books) and even seems to have adopted from him the general plan of his work. In the first decad he follows him unhesitatingly and hence is confident as to 30000 killed VII 36, 13; ib. 37, 16 he speaks of ad quadraginta milia scutorum; IX 27, 14 ad triginta milia caesa aut capta; ib. 43, 17 triginta milibus hostium caesis; ib. 37, 11 even caesa aut capta eo die hostium milia ad sexaginta etc. Only III 5, 12 he has the modest observation: difficile ad fidem est, in tam antiqua re, quot pugnaverint ceciderintve exacto adfirmare numero; audet tamen Antias Valerius concipere summas. But in those periods where better sources were available (e. g. Polybius) Livy discovers the exaggerations of his authority and now blames with all the more bitterness of feeling, since the errors into which he had been led by Valerius could not be rectified owing to the publication of the first decad. Cf. XXVI 49, 3: scorpiones maiores minoresque ad LX captos scripserim si auctorem graecum sequar Silenum, si Valerium Antiatem, maiorum scorpionum sex milia, minorum tredecim: adeo nullus mentiendi modus est. XXX 19, 11: Valerius Antias quinque milia hostium caesa ait. quae tanta res est ut aut impudenter ficta sit (by Antias) aut neglegenter (by others) praetermissa. XXXVI 38, 6: duodetriginta milia hostium caesa Antias Valerius scribit, capta tria milia et quadringentos, signa militaria CXXIV, equos MCCXXX . . ubi ut in numero scriptori parum fidei sit, quia in augendo eo non alius intemperantior est, magnam victoriam fuisse adparet. XXXIII 10, 8: si Valerio quis credat, omnium rerum immodice numerum augenti, quadraginta milia hostium eo die sunt caesa, capta, ubi modestius mendacium est, quinque milia septingenti XXXVIII 23, 8: Valerius Antias, qui magis (than Claudius) immodicus in numero augendo esse solet. See also XXXIX 43, 1: Valerius Antias, ut qui nec Catonis orationem legisset et fabulae tantum sine auctore editae credidisset. Whenever, therefore, Valerius is his only authority for a statement, Livy frequently adds si Valerio credamus (credas) (XXXVI 19, 12. XXXIX 41, 6. XLIV 13, 12) or mentions only his authority (XXXVIII 50, 5. XXXIX 22, 9. 56, 7), sometimes expressly reserving his doubts, e. g. XXXVII 48, 1 sqq. (Valerius Antias auctor est rumorem celebrem Romae fuisse . . . Rumoris huius quia neminem alium auctorem habeo, neque adfirmata res mea opinione sit nec pro vana praetermissa) and XLV 43, 8 (HS ducenties ex ea praeda redactum esse auctor est Antias. . . quod quia unde redigi potuerit non apparebat auctorem pro re posui). It must be admitted that Valerius' lies in numerical statements are quite absurd, it being quite usual with him to have 40,000 enemies and more killed in a battle (Liv. XXXIII 10, 8. 36, 13. XXXIV 15, 9. XXXVI 19, 12. Oros. IV 20). But at Tolosa he surpassed himself by giving as the number of the slain even octoginta milia Romanorum sociorumque, . . quadraginta milia calonum atque lixarum (Oros. V 16). The fact that exaggerations of this kind were merely his fictions, appears also from the frequent isolation of his statements; see Gell. VI (VII) 19, 8: Valerius Antias contra decretorum

memoriam contraque auctoritates veterum annalium dixit. Cf. VII 8, 6. Liv. XXXII 6, 5: Valerius Antias tradit . . XII milia hostium eo proelio caesa etc. ceteri graeci latinique auctores . . nihil memorabile actum . . tradunt. The defence attempted by Krause p. 269 sqq. and Liebaldt p. 12 sq. is a failure. See the collection of his fragments in Krause p. 269 sqq. and Roth p. 351—363; and also Liebaldt, de Valerio Antiate annalium scriptore, Naumburg 1840. 22 pp. 4. Schwegler Hist. of Rome I p. 90—92. Gerlach, Roman Historians p. 83 sq. Nissen, Critical Investigations, p. 43—46. Kieserling, de scriptoribus p. 46—49.

143. L. Cornelius Sisenna (635—687) wrote, besides other works, a history of his time in an archaic diction; but his friend C. Licinius Macer went back to the oldest time and rectified the accounts of it in various places by a diligent study of the sources, though he was too rhetorical and perhaps also too much influenced by a predilection for his Gens.

1. Sisenna was born c. 635 (Roth, Sis. vita p. 4—10), was praetor 676 (SC. de Asclepiade in C. I. lat. I p. 110 sq.: Cos. Q. Lutatio Q. f. Catulo et M. Aemilio . . Lepido, pr. urbano et inter peregrinos L. Cornelio . . f. Sisenna, cf. Cic. Cornel. I 18 and Ascon. p. 73 Or.) and died 687 in Crete, being then Pompey's legate in the war with the Pirates (Dio XXXVI 1 *Κορνήλιος Σισέννας*, cf. Appian. Mithr. 95 *Λούκιος Σισιννᾶς*). C. L. Roth, L. Cornelii Sisennae . . vita, Basle, 1834. 4. — Vellei. II 9, 5: historiarum (O. Jahn: milesiarum) auctor iam tum (at the time of the orators Antonius and Crassus) Sisenna erat iuvenis; sed opus belli civilis (= socialis? A. Riese p. 54 sq.) Sullanique post aliquot annos ab eo seniore editum est. Cic. Brut. 64, 228: inferioris aetatis (than P. Antistius) erat proximus L. Sisenna, doctus vir et studiis optumis deditus, bene latine loquens (but 74, 259 sq.: Sisenna quasi emendator sermonis usitati cum esse vellet non . . deterreri potuit quo minus inusitatis verbis uteretur. . . ille familiaris meus recte loqui putabat esse inusitate loqui), gnarus reip., non sine facetiis, sed neque laboris multi nec satis versatus in causis (but from Brut. 260 it appears that he defended C. Rutilius, and a. 684 he pleaded in behalf of Verres, see Cic. Verr. Acc. II 45, 110. IV 20, 43 cf. ib. 15, 33; the latter he defended together with Hortensius, whose friend he was, Sen. Controv. I prooem. 19 and below 144, 2); interiectusque inter duas aetates Hortensi et Sulpici nec maiorem consequi poterat et minori necesse erat cedere. huius omnis facultas ex historia ipsius perspici potest; quae cum facile omnis vincat superiores (?), tum indicat tamen quantum absit a summo quamque genus hoc scriptionis nondum sit satis latinis litteris illustratum. Leg. I 2, 7: Sisenna, eius (Macer) amicus, omnes adhuc nostros scriptores . . facile superavit. is tamen neque orator . . umquam est habitus et in historia puerile quoddam consectatur, ut unum Clitarchum neque praeterea quemquam de Graecis legisse videatur. It can scarcely be just to compare him with one of

the exaggerating historians of Alexander the Great, if Sallust (himself a historian) be right in saying, Iug. 85, 2: L. Sisenna optume et diligentissume omnium qui eas (Sullae) res dixere persecutus parum mihi libero ore locutus videtur. Significant as to the plan of the work is the statement (in Gell. XII 15, 2): nos una aestate in Asia et Graecia gesta litteris idcirco continentia mandavimus ne vellicatim aut sultuatim scribendo lectorum animos impediremus. The title was Historiae, and the work embraced at least 12 books; beyond this number we have only an isolated quotation in Nonius p. 468, 10: Sisenna Hist. lib. XXIII, instead of which Riese p. 63 proposes XVIII, and others XIIII. Beyond the year 663 we are led by few fragments only which treat of the oldest time (Aeneas etc.), Servius Aen. I 108. 242. XI 316, and should perhaps be attributed to a separate work by Sisenna on the foundation of Rome (Non. p. 127, 29: Sisenna ab urbe condita: iuxtim Numicium flumen obtruncatur, i. e. Aeneas, Riese p. 55 sq.). This, however, does not well agree with Sisenna's peculiarity as a writer and it seems still better to assume that the passages in question occurred in an introduction (in the manner of Sallust), and that in Nonius we should read: Sisenna: ab urbe condita iuxtim etc. The fragments contain much detailed description and traces of speeches (especially in book IV), whence the treatment appears to have been lengthy (longinque, Fronto above 142, 2). Most of the fragments refer to the Marsian war (cf. Cic. de divin. I 44, 99) and are found in Nonius who quotes (but only from books III and IV) the archaic forms of Sisenna. They prove how crotchety Sisenna was in his archaisms; cf. Cicero (Brut.) above, and Varro ap. Gell. II 25, 9: Sisenna unus "adsentio" (not adsentior) in senatu dicebat; cf. Quintil. I 5, 13. The fragments have been collected by Krause p. 303—317 and Roth p. 368—377. A. Riese, on the history of L. Cornelius Sisenna, in the Festschrift zur Begrüssung der XXIV Philologenversammlung (Leipzig 1865) p. 53—64.

2. Sisenna's archaic tendencies are in conformity with his grammatical studies. Rufinus p. 2711 P. = 384 Gaisf. quotes from Sisenna in commentario Poenuli, Sisenna in Rudente, S. in Amphitryone, in Captivis, in Aulularia. He is the earliest Commentator on Plautus; see Ritschl Parerga p. 374 sq. 376—384. Sisenna's commentary on the Amphitruo is also mentioned by Charis. p. 178. 182. 196 P. = 198, 26. 203, 27. 221, 6. 9 K. cf. p. 83. 96 P. = 107, 14 sqq. 120, 10 sqq. K. Ritschl l. l. p. 385 sq. Three of the last four passages treat of adverbs on *im* for which Sisenna showed his preference even in his history. But these observations are not exactly calculated to inspire us with respect for Sisenna's scholarship. As an Epicurean and voluptuary he is characterised by his translation of Aristides' lascivious novels (*Μιλησιακά*); Ovid Trist. II 443 sq.: vertit Aristiden Sisenna, nec obfuit illi Historiae turpes inseruisse iocos. Fronto Epist. p. 62 N.: animadvertas particulatim elegantis . . Sisennam in lasciviis. This work seems to have consisted of 15 books, at least Charisius quotes the second in several places (p. 194. 196. 200. 207. 209 Keil), book XIII and (in the exc. Cauch.) p. 223, 14 K. Sisenna Milesiarum XIIII, and p. 208, 4:

Sisenna Milesiarum XV. See Krause, hist. p. 299—303. Wernicke, Sisenniana, s. Sisennae vita et fragmenta, Thorn 1839. 4. Gerlach, Roman Historians, p. 90—92.

3. C. Licinius L. f. Macer (appears on denarii of the time of Sulla, a. 670—673, see Mommsen, on Roman coins, p. 607, C. I. lat. I p. 137. 434), the father of the orator and poet Calvus (see below 200, 4), trib. pleb. 681, in which dignity Sallust in his Historiae attributed a speech to him; a. 688 he was charged with extortions in his province, which he governed as propraetor, before the tribunal of Cicero who was then praetor, and being found guilty, he committed suicide; see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1075, nr. 1. Cicero Brut. 67, 238 describes him as orator in the following manner: C. Macer auctoritate semper eguit, sed fuit patronus propemodum diligentissimus. huius si vita, si mores, si voltus denique non omnem commendationem ingeni everteret, maius nomen in patronis fuisset. non erat abundans, non inops tamen, non valde nitens, non plane horrida oratio; vox, gestus et omnis actio sine lepore; at in inveniendis componendisque rebus mira accuratio. . . hic etsi etiam in publicis causis probabatur, tamen in privatis illustriorum obtinebat locum. In his judgment of Macer as a historian, Cicero's dislike of him appears even more strongly, de leg. I 2, 7: quid Macrum numerem? cuius loquacitas habet aliquid argutiarum, nec id tamen ex illa erudita Graecorum copia, sed ex librariolis latinis, in orationibus autem (here follows a corrupt passage which certainly contained some trong criticism; Nipperdey, Philologus VI p. 136, writes: multa, in epistolis relatis summa impudentia). This shows that Macer had embodied speeches (and perhaps letters, cf. Nonius p. 259: Licinius Macer in epistula ad senatum) in his work which seems to have been loquacious altogether. Livy's criticism VII 9, 5 is of greater importance and credibility: quaesita ea propriae familiae laus leviorem auctorem Licinium facit. cum mentionem eius rei in vetustioribus annalibus nullam inveniam etc., cf. also Dionys. Hal. Ant. VI 11: *Λικίννιος καὶ οἱ περὶ Γέλλιον οὐδὲν ἐξητακότες οὔτε τῶν εἰκότων οὔτε τῶν δυνατῶν,* and VII 1: *Λικίννιος καὶ Γέλλιος καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων συγγραφέων οὐδὲν ἐξητακότες τῶν περὶ τοὺς χρόνους ἀκριβῶς.* His indifference to points of chronology would agree with the rhetorical character of the work. It is also very probable that the antiaristocratic tendencies of the author manifested themselves in his work, though it does not seem to have treated of his own time. On the other hand, even Cicero's hint as to the librarioli latini proves that he drew directly from independent sources, unlike his predecessors. Cf. Liv. IV 7, 12: Licinius Macer auctor est et in foedere Ardeatino et in linteis libris (see above § 69) ad Monetae inventa. 20, 8: quod tam veteres annales quodque magistratuum libros, quos linteos in aede repositos Monetae Macer Licinius citat identidem auctores. 23, 2 sq.: in tam discrepante editione (of the consuls) et Tubero et Macer libros linteos auctores profitentur. neuter tribunos mil. eo anno fuisse traditum a scriptoribus antiquis dissimulat. Licinio libros haud dubio sequi linteos placet et Tubero incertus veri est. The title of his work was no doubt Annales

and less accurately Historiae. It certainly embraced the oldest time (Macrob. Sat. I 10, 17. Dionys. II 52) and is mentioned expressly by Livy only in his first decad; the latest date, at which he mentions it, being a. 455. Even the number of the books is not known, reliable references being made only to books I and II; then we have Priscian X p. 895 P. = p. 525, 3 sq. Htz. (cf. Diomed. I p. 366 P. = 369, 15 K.: Aemilius Macer: omnium etc.): Aemilius Macer in XVI annalium: omnium etc., where it is just as probable that a confusion has taken place with Licinius Macer, as the reverse has happened in Plin. N. H.; in Nonius p. 221, 11: Licinius Rerum romanarum lib. XXI both name and number cannot be relied upon; C. L. Roth thinks of Clodius Licinus. The fragments are collected by Krause p. 237—242 and Roth p. 363—367. On Macer see Weichert, poetar. lat. vitae p. 92—104. Liebaldt, C. Licinius Macer, Naumburg 1848. 19 pp. 4. and Mommsen H. R. III² p. 591, judge Macer in a one-sided manner, the latter here as well as in Sisenna apparently adopting Cicero's judgment. Schwegler, Hist. of Rome I p. 92 sq., and Kieserling, de rer. script. p. 38—43, are more just. See also Gerlach, the Roman historians, p. 87—90.

144. Like Scaurus, Rutilius Rufus, and Catulus in the preceding epoch, the dictator L. Cornelius Sulla (a. 616—676) wrote an autobiography, commentarii de rebus suis, in 22 books, which were after his death completed by his freedman Epicadus. Lucullus himself (a. 640—797), to whom these Memoirs were dedicated, wrote in his early years a history of the Marsian war, in Greek, and subsequently a certain C. Piso narrated the war between Sulla and Marius.

1. Sulla was Cons. 666 and 674, Dictator 672—675; † 676. Cf. C. Krafft in Pauly's Enc. II p. 669—677. Th. Lau, L. Cornelius Sulla, a biography, Hamburg 1855. The phthiriasis, of which Sulla is said to have died, is in all probability a mere fable; see especially Th. Husemann, Ztschr. of the Physicians of Vienna, edited by Hebra, XII (Vienna 1856) p. 497—533. Plut. Lucull. 1: *Σύλλας τὰς αὑτοῦ πράξεις ἀναγράψων ἐκείνῳ* (Lucullus) *προσεφώνησεν.* Sulla 37: *τὸ εἰκοστὸν καὶ δεύτερον τῶν ὑπομνημάτων πρὸ δυοῖν ἡμερῶν ἢ ἐτελεύτα γράψων ἐπαύσατο.* The title is given as rerum gestarum or suarum libri or commentarii (*ὑπομνήματα*). Sulla in vicesimo primo rerum suarum, Priscian IX 39 p. 864 P. = p. 476, 4 Htz. Plutarch has largely availed himself of these Memoirs in his Lives of Sulla and Marius, to the detriment of historical truth; see H. Peter, on Plutarch's sources (1865) p. 57—60. 100—102. The fragments of them are collected by Krause p. 290—295, and Roth p. 334—338. A Greek epigram by Sulla on a statue of Aphrodite, in two hexameters and a pentameter, is found in the Anth. graeca II p. 66 ed. Jacobs. On the *ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γραφεῖσαι σατυρικαὶ κωμῳδίαι τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ* see above § 8, 1. This statement arose perhaps from a mistaken representation of the fact, that under

Sulla the Atellanae commenced to be written down; see above § 10 and 125.

2. L. Licinius L. f. Lucullus, born c. 640, Cons. 680, † 697; see his elogium in C. I. lat. I p. 292. W. Drumann, Hist. of Rome IV p. 120—174. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. IV p. 1070—1074. He was famous for his riches, and possessed also great mental culture. Plut. Lucull. 1: *ὁ Λούκουλλος ἤσχητο καὶ λέγειν ἱκανῶς ἑκατέραν γλῶτταν, ὥστε καὶ Σύλλας* (see n. 1) . . *ἐκείνῳ προσεφώνησεν ὡς συνταξομένῳ καὶ διαφήσοντι τὴν ἱστορίαν ἄμεινον. . . λέγεται νέον ὄντα πρὸς Ὁρτήσιον τὸν δικολόγον καὶ Σισέννιαν τὸν ἱστορικὸν ἐκ παιδιᾶς τινος εἰς σπουδὴν προελθούσης ὁμολογῆσαι, προθεμένων ποίημα καὶ λόγον ἑλληνικόν τε καὶ ῥωμαϊκόν, εἰς ὅ τι ἂν λάχῃ τούτων, τὸν Μαρσικὸν ἐκτελεῖν πόλεμον. καί πως ἔοικεν εἰς λόγον ἑλληνικὸν ὁ κλῆρος ἀφικέσθαι, διασῴζεται γὰρ ἑλληνική τις ἱστορία τοῦ Μαρσικοῦ πολέμου.* Cf. Cic. ad Att. I 19, 10: non dicam quod tibi ut opinor Panhormi Lucullus de suis historiis dixerat, se, quo facilius illas probaret romani hominis esse, idcirco barbara quaedam et *σόλοικα* dispersisse. He never really employed his talents, nor did he ever attain to cultivated eloquence, though Plut. Luc. 33 calls him *δεινὸς εἰπεῖν*. Cf. Cic. Brut. 62, 222 (oratorem acutum) and Tac. dial. 37 (below 158, 3). He also took a certain interest in philosophy, cf. Plut. Luc. 1: *γενόμενος πρεσβύτερος ἤδη παντάπασιν . . ἀφῆκε τὴν διάνοιαν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ σχολάζειν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθαι, τὸ θεωρητικὸν αὐτῆς ἐγείρας.* Cic. Acad. pr. II 2, 4: maiore studio Lucullus cum omni litterarum generi tum philosophiae deditus fuit quam qui illum ignorabant arbitrabantur, nec vero ineunte aetate solum sed et pro quaestore aliquot annos et in ipso bello. . . cum autem e philosophis . . putaretur Antiochus, Philonis auditor, excellere, eum secum et quaestor habuit (a. 667 sq.) et post aliquot annos imperator. . . delectabatur autem mirifice lectione librorum de quibus audiebat. Cf. de fin. III 2, 7 sq.

3. Plut. Mar. 45: *Γάϊός τις Πείσων, ἀνὴρ ἱστορικός*, whom he quotes as his authority for the death of Marius. As he is not mentioned again, we cannot decide which of the Calpurnii Pisones he was; at all events he is not the L. Piso mentioned above 128, 4.

145. To the epoch of Sulla belong also the Senator L. Manlius who wrote a miraculous account of journeys in the manner of Euhemerus, and the freedmann L. Voltacilius Pilutus, the first man of servile birth who attempted historical writing at Rome. In conformity with his position his work seems to have been of a rhetorical character and in the style of a humble apology.

1. Dionys. Ant. I 19: *χρησμὸς ὃν φησι Λεύκιος Μάλλιος, ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἄσημος, αὐτὸς ἰδεῖν* (at Dodona). Plin. N. H. X 2, 4: primus atque diligentissime togatorum de eo (the phoenix) prodidit Mamilius (in

the list of his authorities in book X: Manilius) senator ille maxumis nobilis doctrinis doctore nullo. .. prodit idem Mamilius .. fuisse eius conversionis annum prodente se P. Licinio Cn. Cornelio cos. (457) ducentesimum quintum decumum. Varro repeatedly quotes this book; see L. L. V 31 (Mallius). VII 16 and 28 (Manilius); cf. Arnob. III 38 (Manilius). Macrob. Sat. I 10, 4 (Mallius). Th. Mommsen, Rhein. Mus. XVI p. 284—287, who considers it possible that he might be the L. Manlius known from coins of Sulla as his proquaestor about 670 (on Roman coins p. 595), and from various writers (Liv. XC. Oros. V 110. Caes. b. c. III 20. Plut. Sertor. 12) as regent of Gallia Narbonensis about 677. It is also probable (Ritschl Par. p. 242) that he is identica with the Manilius mentioned by Gellius (see above 88, 4) as the author of a catalogue of the genuine plays of Plautus.

2. Suet. gramm. 27 = rhet. 3, p. 124 Rffsch.: L. Voltacilius Pilutus (Hieronymus: Plotus) servisse dicitur .. donec ob ingenium et studium litterarum manumissus accusanti patrono subscripsit. deinde rhetoricam professus Cn. Pompeium Magnum (born 648) docuit patrisque eius (Cn. Pompeius Strabo, Cons. 665, † 667) res gestas nec minus ipsius (no doubt in his life-time) compluribus libris exposuit, primus omnium libertinorum, ut Cornelius Nepos opinatur, scribere historiam orsus (see above 31, 3). Jerome on Euseb. Chron. 1936, Ol. 174, 4 = 673 = 81 B. Chr.: Vultacilius Plotus latinus rhetor, Cn. Pompei libertus et doctor, scholam Romae aperuit. His name shows that he rather was the freedman of a certain Voltacilius.

146. After the middle of the seventh century V. C., education and teaching seem to have become more systematic, and we meet with an increased number of the names of those who in Rome as well as in the rest of Italy taught grammar and rhetoric, most of them indeed freedmen and of foreign birth. The majority were also authors on these subjects, and combined antiquarian and literary lore with their grammatical researches. In this period we may mention as the most eminent L. Plotius Gallus, Saevius Nicanor, Aurelius Opilius, Antonius Gnipho and Pompilius Andronicus, Q. Cosconius, Epicadus, Servius Clodius and Staberius Eros.

1. Sueton. gramm. 3, p. 102 Rffsch.: posthac (after Stilo) magis ac magis et gratia et cura artis (grammaticae) increvit, ut ne clarissimi quidem viri abstinuerint quo minus et ipsi aliquid de ea scriberent (e. g. Sisenna, like Lucilius in an earlier time) utque temporibus quibusdam super viginti celebres scholae fuisse in urbe tradantur, and grammatici were paid for at great rates, e. g. Lutatius Daphnis (see above 119, 11), L. Apuleius. iam in provincias quoque grammatica penetraverat, ac nonnulli de notissimis doctoribus peregre docuerunt maxime in Gallia togata; inter quos Octavius Teucer et Sescennius

(? Fesc. or Pesc.?) Lacchus et Oppius Chares. A number of scholars of this period employed also a metrical form, e. g. L. Attius (see 119, 11), Porcius Licinus (123, 3), Q. Valerius Soranus (124, 1), Volcatius Sedigitus (124, 3).

2. L. Plotius Gallus (Suet. rhet. 2 = gramm. 26) primus Romae latinam rhetoricam docuit; see above 36, 8. The date given by Suetonius (ap. Hieronym.), a. 666—667, is in agreement with Cicero's statement pueris nobis (ap. Suet. l. l. cf. Sen. controv. II 8. p. 116, 23 Bu.) or extremis L. Crassi temporibus (Quintil. II 4, 42). Comp. M. Varro ap. Non. p. 79: Autumedo meus, quod apud Plotium rhetorem bubulcitarat, "erili dolori non defuit". According to Quintil. XI 1, 143, he had published a treatise de gestu. Hunc eundem (nam diutissime vixit) M. Caelius .. significat dictasse Atratino accusatori suo actionem (Suet. rhet. 2).

3. Saevius Nicanor primus ad famam dignationemque docendo pervenit fecitque praeter commentarios, quorum tamen pars maxima intercepta dicitur, saturam quoque, in qua libertinum se ac duplici cognomine esse .. indicat, Sueton. gramm. 5, p. 104 Rffsch. His satires appear, therefore, like those of Lucilius and Horace, to have been portraitures of his own individuality. Suetonius quotes from them two hexameters, in which *s* final is disregarded prosodiacally.

4. Sueton. gramm. 6, p. 105 Rffsch.: Aurelius Opilius, Epicurei cuiusdam libertus, philosophiam primo, deinde rhetoricam, novissime grammaticam docuit. dimissa autem schola Rutilium Rufum (above 136, 1—3) damnatum in Asiam secutus (about a. 660) ibidem Smyrnae simulque consenuit (hence Symmachus Epist. I 15 makes the mistake of taking him for Rutilius' master), composuitque variae eruditionis aliquot volumina, ex quibus novem unius corporis .. Musarum .. inscripsisse se ait ex numero divarum et appellatione (cf. Gell. I 25, 17: Aurelius Opilius in primo librorum quos Musarum inscripsit). 'To judge from the specimen given by Gellius, his Musae contained verbal explanations, and to this work we should probably refer the numerous quotations in Varro L. L. and espec. in Festus, where he is sometimes called Aurelius (Varro VII 65. 70. 106. Fest. p. 68. 147 etc.), sometimes Opilius (Varro VII 50. 67. 79. Fest. p. 85), sometimes also Aurelius Opilius (Fest. p. 141) and Opilius Aurelius (Fest. p. 163). See Egger, serm. lat. reliqu. p. 27 sqq. As an author of glosses he paid special attention to Plautus, though he cannot be considered a scholiast on that author. Gellius III 3, 1 mentions him among the authors of indices on the Plautine plays, to which category his libellus qui inscribitur Pinax with the acrostich Opilius in the title (Suet. l. l.) would seem to belong. F. Osann (Ztsch. f. AW. 1849, p. 199 sqq.) conjectured the acrostichs prefixed to the Plautine plays to have been derived from this source. Ritschl, Parerga p. 180. 239 sq. 321. 364 sq. XV sq. F. Osann, on Aurelius Opilius the grammarian, Ztsch. f. AW. 1849, n. 25—28.

5. M. Antonius Gnipho, ingenuus in Gallia natus; sed expositus, ..

fuisse, dicitur ingenii magni, .. nec minus graece quam latine doctus. .. docuit primum in D. Iulii (born 654) domo pueri adhuc, deinde in sua privata. docuit autem et rhetoricam, ita ut quotidie praecepta eloquentiae traderet, declamaret vero nonnisi nundinis. scholam eius claros quoque viros frequentasse aiunt, in his M. Ciceronem, etiam cum praetura fungeretur (a. 688, cf. Macrob. Sat. III, 12, 8). scripsit multa, quamvis annum aetatis quinquagesimum non excesserit. etsi Ateius Philologus (his pupil, Suet. gramm. 10) non tantum volumina De latino sermone (cf. Quintil. I 6, 23) reliquisse eum tradit, nam cetera scripta discipulorum eius esse, non ipsius. Suet. gramm. 7. p. 105 sq. Rffsch.

6. M. Pompilius Andronicus, natione Syrus, studio Epicureae sectae desidiosior in professione grammaticae habebatur. .. itaque cum se in urbe non solum Antonio Gniphoni sed ceteris etiam deterioribus postponi videret Cumas transiit ibique in otio vixit et multa composuit, especially Annalium Enni Elenchi, subsequently edited by Orbilius under the name of their author. Sueton. gramm. 8, p. 106 Rffsch.

7. Q. Cosconius, quoted as an authority in Suetonius' vita Terentii (p. 32, 13 Rffsch.); see above 97, 6. He is no doubt the same as the grammarian mentioned by Varro L. L. VI 36 and 89 (Cosconius in Actionibus). Ritschl in Reifferscheid's Suetonius p. 518.

8. Cornelius Epicadus (see above 144, 1) in eo libro quem de metris scripsit, Mar. Victorin. p. 1957 P. Epicadus de cognominibus, Charis. I p. 85 P. = 110, 3 K.

9. Ser. Clodius, eques rom. and son-in-law of L. Aelius; see above 137, 1. Plin. N. H. XXV 7, 24: tradit M. Varro, Ser. Clodium eq. rom. etc. Suet. gramm. 3, p. 102 Rffsch.: cum librum soceri nondum editum fraude intercepisset, ob hoc repudiatus secessit ab urbe. After his death his half-brother Papirius Paetus presented Cicero with the papers and books left by him; see ad Att. I 20, 7 (Ser. Claudius) and II 1, 12 both a. 694). Cf. ad Fam. IX 16, 4 (to Paetus): Servius, frater tuus, quem litteratissimum fuisse iudico, facile diceret „hic versus Plauti non est, hic est", quod tritas aures haberet notandis generibus poetarum et consuetudine legendi. Varro L. L. VII 106 (cf. 80 and 66) mentions him after Aurelius (above n. 4), whose whole direction he appears to have shared, being also a glossographer (Varro l. l. cf. Gell. XIII 23, 19 in commentario Ser. Claudii. Serv. Aen. I 52 and II 229: Clodius commentariorum. I 176: Clodius scribit, commentariorum IV°) and the author of a catalogue of the genuine plays of Plautus (Gell. III 3, 1). See Ritschl Par. p. 242 sq. p. 365 sq. Fr. Oehler (Rh. Mus. XVIII p. 253—261, on the glossae Servii grammatici) attributes to him the (about 2000) glossae in Labbaeus' glossary marked with S.

10. Staberius Eros .. emptus de catasta (cf. Plin. N. H. XXXV 18, 58) .. temporibus Sullanis proscriptorum liberos .. gratis in disciplinam recepit, Suet. gramm. 13. Fronto p. 20 Naber: quorum libri (those of the old Roman authors) pretiosiores habentur .. si sunt a Lampadione aut Staberio (scripti). Priscian VIII p. 385, 1 Htz.: Staberius de pro

portione. (He lived to be the master of Brutus and Cassius (Suet. l. l.). It was probably a mere fiction that Publilius, Manilius and he came to Italy eadem nave (Plin. l. l., who exaggerates in calling him conditor grammaticae).

147. The two Sasernae and, later on, Scrofa, perhaps also Manilius Sura and Licinius Maenas, wrote on husbandry and domestic economy, about the time of Sulla or somewhat earlier.

1. Saserna is a cognomen of the gens Hostilia (see A. Haakh in Pauly's Cyclop. III p. 1530, n. 13). Colum. I 1, 12 (see above 44, 1): post hunc (Catonem) duos Sasernas, patrem et filium, qui eam diligentius erudierunt. Varro R. R. I 2, 22: sequar Sasernarum, patris et filii, libros. Sasernae in the list of Pliny's authorities N. H. X, Sasernae pater et filius, ib. XIV, XV, XVII, XVIII, cf. XI (Saserna) and XVII 14, 22: arbusti ratio mirum in modum damnata Sasernae patri filioque, celebrata Scrofae, vetustissimis post Catonem peritissimisque. See Varro R. R. I 16, 5: Sasernae liber praecipit. 18, 2: Saserna scribit. Columella I 1, 4 sq.: id non spernendus auctor rei rusticae Saserna videtur adcredidisse. nam eo libro quem de agricultura scriptum reliquit etc. Perhaps the son may have completed and published the work left by his father in a fragmentary state.

2. Varro R. R. I 2, 10: collegam (Varro), XVvir qui fuit ad agros dividundos Campanos, .. Cn. Tremellium Scrofam, virum omnibus virtutibus politum, qui de agricultura Romanus peritissimus existimatur. II 1, 11: Scrofa noster, cui haec aetas defert rerum rusticarum omnium palmam. He wrote also on this subject; see n. 1. Colum. I 1, 12 (Scrofa Tremellius. 6. II 1, 4 (Tremellius). Pliny mentions him in his list of authorities on N. H. XI. XIV. XV. XVII. XVIII, always as Scrofa.

3. Manilius Sura is mentioned by Pliny among his authorities on book VIII. X. XI. XVII. XVIII. XIX., but only XVIII 42 in the text (Cato .. Sura Mamilius .. Varro). See Th. Mommsen, Rh. Mus. XVI p. 282.

4. Colum. XII 4, 2: tum demum nostri generis postquam a bellis otium fuit quasi quoddam tributum victui humano conferre non dedignati sunt, ut M. Ambivius et Maenas Licinius, tum etiam C. Matius, quibus studium fuit pistoris et coci nec minus cellarii diligentiam suis praeceptis instituere. If we may believe this enumeration to be in chronological order, Ambivius should be placed in the first half of the 7th century V. C. A certain Menas is also mentioned in Varro R. R. II 3, 11, cf. 1, 1. 8, 1. On Matius, the contemporary of Cicero, see Colum. XII 44, 1: quae C. Matius diligentissime persecutus est .. illi enim propositum fuit urbanas mensas et lauta convivia instruere. libros tres edidit, quos inscripsit nominibus Coci et Cetarii et Salgamarii.

148. The whole period from 650 to 675 offered little leisure for philosophical studies; those, however, who pursued them,

were pretty regularly Stoics, when jurists; adherents of the New Academy, when orators, or perhaps also Peripatetics. The Epicurean System found adherents only among those who kept aloof from public life.

1. Cic. de or. III 21, 78: quid .. C. Velleius agere potest quam ob rem voluptas sit summum bonum quod ego non possim vel tutari .. vel refellere .. hac dicendi arte in qua Velleius est rudis? .. quid est quod aut Sex. Pompeius (above 141, 4) aut duo Balbi aut .. qui cum Panaetio vixit M. Vigellius de virtute homines stoici possint dicere? de deor. nat. I 6, 15: cum C. Velleio senatore, ad quem tum Epicurei primas ex nostris deferebant. .. etiam Q. Lucilius Balbus, qui tantos progressus habebat in Stoicis ut cum excellentibus in eo genere Graecis compararetur. In the same period we meet with Q. Catulus (above 136, 4), C. Cotta (above 140, 4) and L. Lucullus (144, 2), adherents of Antiochus (Academy), somewhat later M. Pisó (Cons. 693), an older contemporary of Cicero (Cic. Brut. 64, 230, cf. Asconius in Pis. p. 15 Or.), through the agency of the Peripatetic Staseas (Cic. de or. I 22, 104) an adherent of his system (Cic. d. déor. n. I 7, 16. ad Att. XIII 19, 4); in a similar manner the triumvir M. Crassus was won over by Alexander Polyhistor (Plut. Crass. 3). Besides those already mentioned, espec. Q. Scaevola (above 141, 1), and of the earlier ones P. Rutilius Rufus (136, 2) and L. Stilo (137, 1) declared for the Stoa. Epicureans were, besides Vellejus, T. Albucius (135, 4) and Pompilius Andronicus (146, 6). The author of the Rhetorica ad Herennium (149, 2) shows also interest in philosophy.

2. The earliest Epicurean writers among the Romans, Amafinius, Rabirius, Catius, seem to belong to the time of Cicero, to judge from the manner in which Cicero speaks of them, Acad. post. I 2, 5. See below 160.

149. An important literary production of Sulla's time survives in the four books of Rhetorica ad Herennium, a complete manual drawn from Greek sources, but with practical Roman tendencies, omitting all a Roman would have regarded as mere unnecessary refinement, and illustrating the rhetorical figures with instances taken from the Roman orators of the preceding brilliant 20 or 30 years, except where the illustrations were made for the purpose. The mode of treating the subject-matter shows clear and independent thought as well as an original mind and national pride. The author would seem to have enjoyed an independent position in life. His name has not been handed down, but there is reason to infer, from a passage of Quintilian, that it was Cornificius.

1. For the characteristic features of the work see esp. I 1, 1: illa quae gracci scriptores inanis adrogantiae causa sibi adsumpserunt reliquimus; .. nos ea quae videbantur ad rationem dicendi pertinere sumpsimus; non enim spe quaestus aut gloria commoti venimus ad scribendum, quemadmodum ceteri etc.; and IV 7, 10: nomina rerum graeca convortimus. . . reliquum scripturae consumetur in exemplis. haec si aliena posuissemus, factum esset ut etc. his de causis, cum artis inventionem probassemus Graecorum, exemplorum rationem secuti non sumus. IV 1, 1: nihil neque ante rem neque praeter rem locuti sumus.

2. For the personal position of the author see I 1, 1: etsi negotiis familiaribus impediti vix satis otium studio suppeditare possumus, et id ipsum quod datur oti lubentius in philosophia consumere consuevimus, tamen tua nos, C. Herenni, voluntas commovit ut de ratione dicendi conscriberemus. IV 56, 69: simul lubenter exercemur (Herennius and the author) propter amicitiam, cuius initium cognatio fecit, cetera philosophiae ratio confirmavit. III 2, 3: si quando de re militari aut de administratione reip. scribere velimus. IV 12, 17: haec qua ratione vitare possimus in arte grammatica dilucide dicemus. The instance IV 54, 68: modo consul quondam is deinde primus erat civitatis, and: proficiscitur in Asiam, deinde hostis est dictus, post imperator et populi rom. consul factus est, justifies the assumption that the last book was completed either after Sulla's death or at least during his dictatorship.

3. Numerous parts of the work are literally used by Cicero in his juvenile treatise de inventione: see 169, 1. The tripartite division of insinuatio, e. g., described as original ad Her. I 9, 16, is simply appropriated by Cic. de inv. I 17, 23. The very discrepancies found in many principal points (C. L. Kayser, Ed. p. IX sq. and Munich Gel. Anz. 1852, p. 482—487) prove this agreement to have arisen from more than mere coincidence of the authorities used by both writers.

4. The fact of Jerome, Fortunatianus, Priscian and others considering the work as a production of Cicero (Kayser, Ed. p. XII sq.), shows only their want of criticism. Other conjectures as to the person of the author (e. g. Antonius Gnipho or Aelius Stilo etc.) have but little probability. The assumption of the authorship of Cornificius (brought in vogue by C. L. Kayser, Munich Gel. Anz. 1852 p. 492 sqq. and in his edition) is supported by Quintilian, I. O. III 1, 21 where, after mentioning Cicero, he says scripsit de eadem materia (Rhetorica) non pauca Cornificius, aliqua Stertinius. He quotes various passages from Cornificius' work, espec. Latin terms for Greek expressions (cf. n. 1), which are found in the Rhet. ad Her. in precisely the same manner. E. g. V 10, 2: ideo illud Cornificius contrarium appellat = ad Her. IV 18; IX 2, 27: oratio libera, quam Cornificius licentiam vocat = Her. IV 36, 48; 3, 71: Cornificius hanc traductionem vocat = Her. IV 14, 20; 3, 91: et hoc Cornificius atque Rutilius σχῆμα λέξεως putant = Her. IV 25, 35; 3, 98: adicit his . . Cornificius interrogationem etc. = Her. IV 15—30. In other places Quintilian borrows illustrations from the same work, without naming it, e. g. IX 3, 31 (= Her. IV 14,

20). 56 (= Her. IV 25, 34). 70 (= Her. IV 21, 29). 72 (= Her. IV 22, 30). We know of several Cornificii in the time of Cicero, e. g. one who a. 680 was scriba to the praetor Verres (Verr. Acc. I 57, 150), a senator P. Cornificius (Ascon. in Mil. p. 37) and Q. Cornificius, a. 685 tr. pleb. (Ver. act. prima 10, 30: Q. Manlium et Q. Cornificium, duos severissimos atque integerrimos iudices, quod tribuni pl. tum erunt, iudices non habebimus; cf. Ascon. in tog. cand. p. 82 Or.: vir sobrius ac sanctus), 690 Cicero's competitor for the consulship (Cic. ad Att. I 1, 1) and mentioned as senator by Sall. Cat. 47, 4 and Cic. ad Att. I 13, 3. Kayser (Ed. p. VI) declares in favour of the last-named as the author of this work.

5. The work was much used and copied in the middle ages; for the mss. containing it see Kayser Ed. p. XV—XXX. C. Halm, Analecta Tulliana, Fasc. I: lect. var. ad libros rhet. qui ad Her. inscripti sunt ex coll. cum brevi adnot. critica, München 1852. J. Simon, on the mss. of the Rhet. ad Her. I. Schweinfurt 1863. 4. II. Schweinfurt 1864. 4.

Edition by P. Burmann (with Cic. de. inv.), Lugd. Bat. 1761, and espec. Cornifici Rhetoricorum ad C. Herennium libri IV, rec. et interpretatus est C. L. Kayser, Lips. 1854. XXX and 328 pp. 8°. See also Kayser, Heidelb. Jahrb. 1854, p. 411—413, and Philol. XII p. 271—279. C. Halm, Contributions to the textual criticism of the Rhet. ad Her., Rh. Mus. XV p. 536—573. L. Spengel, on the interpolations in the Rhet. ad Her., ibid. XVI p. 391—413. C. Hensel, on Cornificius' Rhet., in Jahn's Jahrb. 93 p. 751—854.

On the work see C. L. Kayser, Münchner Gel. Anz. 1852, Nr. 59—62. A. Kammrath, de librorum rhett. ad C. Herennium auctore, Holzminden 1858. 23 pp. 8. J. Forchhammer, Kort udsigt etc. 1857 sq. (see Philologus XVI p. 574). Mommsen, Hist. of Rome II² p. 457. W. Teuffel, on Cic. writings (Tübi. 1863. 4.) p. 23—26. F. Blass, History of Greek eloquence. (1865) p. 121 sq.

150. Among the prose-inscriptions placed between 600 and 670 V. C. we should especially mention the public deeds, such as the tabula Bantina, lex repetundarum, agraria etc.

1. The tabula Bantina was found at Bantia in Apulia, and on one side contains a Latin, on the reverse an Oscan text (not however agreeing with the Latin); it belongs to a. V. C. 621—636. It was first published a. 1795. The extant part contains laws tending to the security of the Bantian constitution. See the facsimile in Ritschl's P. L. M. E. XIX; a text, explanation (see also A. Kirchhoff, the laws of the town of Bantia, Berlin 1853) etc. by Th. Mommsen, C. I. Lat. I (1863) p. 45—48.

2. Lex Acilia (formerly incorrectly Servilia) repetundarum of the year 631 or 632, first completely published by F. Ursinus, Rome 1583, best explained by C. A. C. Klenze (Berlin 1825. 4.). A facsimile

(together with n. 5 below) in Ritschl's P. L. M. E. XXIII—XXVIII; text and explanation by Th. Mommsen l. l. p. 49—72.

3. To the period of the Gracchi belong also the fragments of a lex de quaestione perpetua (Ritschl, tab. III, Mommsen n. 207 sq. p. 126), and the inscription of L. Betilienus L. f. Vaarus of Aletrium, ib. 1166, p. 239.

4. The decision of the umpires Q. and M. Minucius in a dispute about limits between the Genuates and Viturii, of A. V. C. 637, discovered 1506, is found in Ritschl, tab. XX, Th. Mommsen p. 72—74.

5. Lex agraria of a. V. C. 643, formerly called lex Thoria (which was however a. 635 or 636), perhaps by the trib. pl. C. Baebius (Sall. Iug. 32 sq.), preserved on the reverse of the lex repet. n. 2, Mommsen l. l. p. 75—106.

6. The edict of the praetor L. Cornelius Cn. f. to the Tiburtes, probably of the middle of the 7th century, first printed 1583, Mommsen l. l. p. 107 sq.

7. Lex parieti faciendo of Puteoli, of a. 649, but cut as late as the Imperial period, C. I. lat. I 577. p. 163—165.

III.

SECOND PERIOD.

THE GOLDEN AGE OF ROMAN LITERATURE.

Ciceronian and Augustan age, a. 671—770 V. C.

A. Ciceronian age, a. 671—711 V. C.

151. The golden age of the Roman literature is that period in which its climax was reached in the perfection of form, and in most respects also in the methodical treatment of the subject-matters. It may be subdivided between two generations, in the first of which (the Ciceronian age) prose culminated, while poetry was principally developed in the Augustan age.

In the beginning of the Ciceronian period, the overthrow of the popular party and the victory of the nobility were accomplished facts. But a condition like that was both untenable and injustifiable. Had the nobility been less degenerated and absorbed by egotism, its domination might have been lasting; but the nation, in outward semblance risen to terrible power, owing to the extension of the Roman citizenship to all Italians, was in reality henceforth a blind tool in the hands of unscrupulous ambition. All was ripe for monarchy, though Sulla found it troublesome to maintain his absolute power; even such an adventurer as Catiline dared to stretch his hand for this prize, and had Cn. Pompey been possessed of greater firmness, he could scarcely have missed it; but the spoilt favourite of fortune was by his vanity and sensitiveness brought to a wavering and vacillating conduct which ended in depriving him of the respect and confidence of both parties and served to smooth the way for Caesar, who was clear as to his purpose and the means of attaining it. The first fruit of this state of things was the first triumvirate (694 = 60 B. C.), the second the war between Pompey and Caesar, Pompey's death, Caesar's victory and monarchical sway. The ill-planned assassination of Caesar led merely to a second death of the already expired Republic, in a new civil war; the agony commenced again, and again a triumvirate was the next step to monarchy; the first triumvirs had exiled Cicero, the second killed him.

This period is not conspicuous for the same feverish excitement as the time of Sulla, the internal exhaustion of the one of the contending parties, the Nobility, being unequal to it; but there was no lack of stirring life. For a long time the contention of the factions was continued with weapons drawn from the armoury of the mind, the word, and the pen, in the market-place and in the senate, even after brutal power had gained the ascendancy and gladiators at first, and trained armies afterwards, were the real decisive elements. Eloquence, historical and political composition were, therefore, still predominant in this period. But the novel feature of it is that now one branch of literature after the other climbs to the height of art, as the prejudice which assumed that literary occupations were of no importance, and deeds alone worthy of attention, began to disappear. This fact attests the subjection of the Roman mind to the influence of the Greeks, which about this time became quite a settled fact and assumed larger proportions from year to year. It is true that there was no lack of men who stood true to their national colours: e. g. Varro; but they had less influence and formed only a small minority. In the ruling circles the estrangement from the people and the Roman modes of thinking was quite universal; the common aim of all being, as fast as possible, by any means whatever, whether depredations or venality, to get a chance of equalling others in their mad dissipation. Lusts raised to an unnatural pitch were met by the over-refined culture of the Greeks, whose fashions at last became a positive necessity of life. Greeks were now in all houses, either as tutors, readers, or companions at home and in journeys, and frequently we find men of great mental culture and knowledge in the service of Roman magnates, from whom they knew how to obtain a large share of respect; Lucullus had Antiochus, M. Crassus Alexander Polyhistor, L. Piso Philodemus. Staseas, too, the companion of M. Piso, and Philagrus, who lived with Metellus Nepos, seem to have been men above the ordinary run; Cicero had Diodotus Lyson and Apollonius around him; M. Brutus had Strato Posidonius and Empylus. The majority, of course, did not consider the whole as very serious business, on either side; the Greeks wanting to be rid of the trouble of providing for their maintenance, and the Romans merely wished to have philosophers, poets or men with ready pens among their

trains. But men of intellect who had not inherited riches and high station, perceived in Greek culture an excellent means of enabling them to surpass their predecessors by superior achievements of their own and of thus raising themselves. Even before this, exiles had in preference chosen Greek towns as their places of residence, e. g. Metellus and Rutilius Rufus; now it became the fashion for aspiring young Romans to make eastern tours for the completion of their education, especially to the principal seats of philosophical and rhetorical schools, Athens, Rhodes and Mytilène; and at the close of the Ciceronian period it was even a necessary requirement of a superior education, to visit a Greek University, as may be seen by the example of Cicero's son, Horace, L. Bibulus, Messala and others. But besides the living Greeks of the period, Rome was also invaded by their ancestors in their immortal works; before this, Aemilius Paullus had after his victory over Perseus brought a Greek library to Rome; after the capture of Athens by Sulla, the library of Apellicon, and with it most writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus, arrived at Rome; Lucullus sent there rich literary spoils made in Pontus; henceforth there were real lovers and connoisseurs of books at Rome (e. g. Varro and Cicero) and gradually a book-trade was formed, Atticus for instance being a publisher and bookseller. Latin translations of Greek works increased. The higher classes did not, of course, require them, as they were quite conversant with Greek and employed it with predilection even for familiar and jocular purposes; but wider circles could be influenced only through the medium of translations. These were not now confined to dramatic literature; the aristocratic circles willingly left the people to their national amusements and delighted themselves in Greek performances. But the productions of Greek immorality and freethinking were now translated into Latin, e. g. the novels of Aristides by Sisenna, and Epicurean works by Amafinius and others. At a later period, Cicero and then Messala translated Greek works of a serious character. It may be easily imagined that it was the fault of the Greek instructors themselves that the genuine old Greek literature did not come into the hands of their Roman pupils, but the light literature of the period. Hence the orators trained themselves not so much after the model of Demosthenes, but of

the Greek rhetoricians of Asia Minor, where the Greek character was considerably alloyed with Oriental features; and when, at a subsequent period, later orators made Lysias their model, this mistake was increased by the fact of the same men choosing the Alexandrines as their models in poetry. The Greek mind was, however, so marvellously rich and imperishable, that in spite of this it exercised an important influence, and did not make itself felt merely in the destruction it caused; on the contrary to its alliance with the Roman mind, are due most literary productions of the period. They do not, indeed, disclaim their Roman origin which appears in the prevalence of practical tendencies in literature; in the want of refinement in some, e. g. Lucretius and Catullus, and in the crotchets of others, e. g. Sallust. But the influence of the Greeks leaves clearer traces in the variety, manysidedness, high estimation and popularity gained by literature, and especially in the great attention paid to form, an attention carried to an almost excessive worship of formal perfection at the close of the Ciceronian period.

The practical tendencies in literature and the influence of a period of great political excitement became conspicuous in the fields now especially selected for literary cultivation. Eloquence above all now reached its climax. Even before, when Greek taste and art had influenced only individuals, the Romans might be said to have surpassed the Greeks in the thorough treatment of political and legal questions; and even at the beginning of this period Hortensius was a brillant example of the high achievements attainable by Roman talent, though trained in a one-sided manner. By mere natural talent, it was scarcely possible to advance any further; but it was possible to progress in art and methodical training — an advance made by Cicero. Never tired of learning and ever working to cultivate his mind, he enlarged both the horizon and materials of eloquence; he brought great accomplishments, a distinct knowledge of the rules of his art, and a refined perception of the beauty and aptitude of phraseology to bear upon a Latin style which, until then cut up and irregular, he now subjected to rules, order, and regularity. Such contemporaries as Caesar willingly acknowledged his superiority and classicality in this point. In the close of his life he had indeed to experience the charges of being antiquated, and too

much in the Asiatic style, from a younger generation who claimed the name of Atticists exclusively for themselves, and in the period immediately following him, Sallust and Asinius Pollio rebelled against his style. In the main points, however, he came out victorious, his phraseology, terms and constructions becoming the standard of classicality, and when Rome itself had long ceased to follow his example, it was honourably revived in later centuries.

In connexion with the methodical development of eloquence its theoretical treatment, i. e. rhetoric, increased in importance. Here the Greeks were now the rulers, Hermagoras, Molon, Apollodorus and Theodorus; the manuals written by them were used for instruction either in the originals or in Latin translations, Valgius for example being the author of one of them. Cicero who in his early years had followed the same track in his treatise de inventione, in his riper years pursued rather the plan of the rhetoric ad Herennium, leaving aside technical disputes of the various schools, and enlarging the popular mode of dealing with his subject. This he did by replacing the sober, severe and methodical manner of that work by interesting dialogues on the principal questions of rhetoric, made attractive and instructive by the rich stores of his knowledge and the variety and extent of his experience.

Next to this, political literature prospered in those days. With the gradual increase of general education, the pen had become a power, and there was abundance of hands to wield it. All persons and facts of importance in this period were, therefore, soon surrounded with a literature of pamphlets, memoirs and biographies. We may also explain the great attention given to the religious ceremonies in treatises by A. Caecina, Appius Pulcher, Valerius Messala, Trebatius, from their great importance in politics. A great deal of correspondence turned on politics, and historical composition was even more connected with this department, as may be seen from Caesar's example. Beside this political treatment of historical subjects, the old manner of the Annalists was still continued by a few, and methodically so by Cornelius Nepos. Varro's historical works were large repositories of facts; M. Varro, Atticus and Cornelius Nepos wrote abridgements, all three furnishing also specimens of a comparative mode of historical composition, in which Greeks and Romans were compared

with one another. The establishment of an official gazette (acta diurna) by Caesar (a. 695 = 59) and the invention of stenography (notae Tironianae) promoted the accumulation of materials for subsequent historians. In Sallust, this period possesses the representative of a new direction, in which a consciousness of the task of writing history as an art led to the imitation of Greek models in the description of facts and characters.

In proportion to the increase of general education scholarship and learning gained in importance. Varro especially, a man of honest national tendencies, collected in his long life astonishing stores of learning and published them in his works in such abundance that subsequent centuries continued to draw upon them. Beside him, Valerius Cato, Nigidius Figulus and Santra enjoyed most authority, and even some aristocrats (e. g. Valerius Messala, cons. 701) contributed to the investigation of Roman antiquities. The teachers, as a class, derived as yet little personal advantage from the reviving zeal for education. Men of free birth rarely devoted themselves to that profession, e. g. Orbilius Pupillus, and he was never fond of it; the majority were freedmen of Greek descent, e. g. Curtius Nicias, Lenaeus, Atteius Praetextatus, Caecilius Epirota.

Besides these professors, Greece furnished Rome also with philosophers, who established there the practice of philosophical disputation and composition. In rare instances only were these occupations taken up with such zeal as in the case of Cato, who was a thorough Stoic, and Lucretius, who was a zealous Epicurean; the majority gathered from the various systems the fruits agreeable to their tastes. Philosophical writers followed the example of the principal Greek philosophers of the period in adopting an eclecticism, the ingredients of which were mixed so as to suit individual tastes. M. Varro, for instance, adhered to the Academy in Ethics, in all other departments to the Stoa; M. Brutus on the other hand was a Stoic in Ethics, but in all things else an Academician, and Cicero delighted in setting one system against the other in philosophical disputation. Independently of the works of Lucretius, we possess in this period, the philosophical writings of Cicero, which are principally remarkable for their form and the dexterity with which the Latin language is employed for the new subjects.

Poetry held in this period a subordinate position for a long time, and besides the attempts of M. Varro and M. Cicero, only the works of Valerius Cato, Furius Bibaculus and Q. Cicero deserve to be mentioned. M. Varro was the most important of them, and on account of the great variety of metres used by him especially in his saturae Menippeae, and of the severe laws which he imposed upon himself, he may be accounted a predecessor of the poets who imitated Alexandrine models. In the second half of this period, the influence of Greek culture appears also in the increased attention bestowed upon poetry. The first important result of this movement may be perceived in the didactic poem of Lucretius which in spite of its thorough Roman austerity and archaic style, is pervaded by a spirit of freethinking and in its form keeps to the path pointed out by Ennius. The younger generation cultivated the various branches of poetry and attempted the most varied forms, Catullus with great genius and success; besides him also his friends Licinius Calvus and Helvius Cinna, and also Varro Atacinus and Cassius of Parma. The drama alone was not attempted by them; in their self-sufficient manner they turned away from the people and thought little of writing for them, content to imitate the correctness of the Alexandrine poets. The stage was therefore limited to the old drama, and such excellent actors, as the tragedian Aesopus and the comedian Roscius, breathed new life into the plays of the tragic and comic poets of the 6th century V. C. Among the popular kinds, the Mimus became of importance in the course of the Ciceronian period. The Roman knight Laberius worked in this direction, and it was also made popular by the freedman and actor Publilius Syrus. Laberius gained for the Mimus a place in literature.

In this time the last remnant of national prosody disappeared. Final *s*, scarcely audible in actual pronunciation, and hence disregarded by Ennius before consonants, was by the poets of the Alexandrine School systematically and regularly treated as a full consonant, though even M. Varro and Lucretius had disregarded it in prosody, in a number of cases proportionally not very numerous.[1]) But the elision of final *m* before a following vowel was always retained. A symptom

[1]) Cf. J. Jessen, Quaestiones Lucretianae p. 22—26.

of the ascendancy gained by Greek culture may be observed even in the fact that at this time the Latin alphabet was enriched by the Greek letters *y* and *z*, and that the Greek aspirates were now rendered in Latin writing by *th*, *ph*, *ch*.[1]) A long *i* was, after the time of Sulla, marked either by an I reaching above the other letters, or by an apex (accent).[2])

The literary characters of the Ciceronian period differ very strongly according as they belong either to the first or second half of it, the older or younger generation. Those of the first half, whose youth fell into the terrible struggles between Marius and Sulla, preserved both in their life and literary productions a certain serious tone of mind, which may be recognized even in Furius Bibaculus. The close of the 7th century and the beginning of the eighth we know, from Cicero and Sallust, to have been a period of tempestuous excitement; it was the period of such persons as Clodius and Clodia, when dissoluteness was considered genius, and ancient Roman honesty had disappeared from life and literature.[3]) The younger generation, who grew up in this atmosphere and were speedily drawn into this whirlpool, were swallowed up by it, their strength was rapidly spent in sensual enjoyments, and they came to an early end. When contrasted with the old Roman writers, who preserved a patriarchal character even in the great age they attained, it seems strange that the authors of this epoch were so short-lived, e. g. Catullus, Calvus, Caelius Rufus, and partly also Lucretius and Sallust. In this respect as well as in their literary tendencies they were the precursors of such Augustan poets as Tibullus and Propertius, who however were depressed by the political conditions of their time. Those of them who arrived at a higher age did not reach their zenith until the time of Augustus, e. g. Trebatius, Asinius Pollio, Q. Tubero, C. Matius.

[1]) Cic. orat. 48, 160. Quintil. XII 10, 27.

[2]) Ol. Kellermann in O. Jahn's Spec. epigraph. (Kiel 1841) p. 105 sqq. F. Ritschl, Rhein. Mus. XIV p. 299 sqq. 378 sqq. 487 sq. P. L. M. E. Suppl. V (Bonn 1864) p. XIV sq. W. Schmitz, studia orthoëp. et orthogr. lat., Düren 1860. 4.

[3]) Cic. p. Cael. 17, 40: haec genera virtutum non solum in moribus nostris, sed vix iam in libris reperiuntur.

These two generations are also divided by their national and political tendencies. In the older generation there is a marked difference between the prose-styles of Varro and Cicero, the one representing antiquarian traditions, the other progress; in the younger generation Lucretius and Catullus show the same antithesis in poetry; the first national and bent upon his subject-matter. As to principle, Cicero appears to be on the same ground with Catullus and his friends; but the same principle is there carried out with discretion, and here with one-sided exclusiveness, the fashionable poets slighting the antiquated Cicero, and he ridiculing the new poetasters whose highest standard in eloquence was Lysias and in poetry Euphorion.[1]) In politics also the younger generation are divided, some being for the republic — e. g. Catullus, Calvus, and the principal members of the conspiracy against Caesar, M. and D. Brutus, C. Cassius and Cassius of Parma —, others belonging to Caesar's party, e. g. Sallust, C. Matius, Q. Tubero, M. Antony, Curio, Asinius Pollio etc.

It is, moreover, characteristic of this time that after the removal (in the Marsian war) of the last barriers between Rome and Italy, the Italian municipia showed an increasing interest in literature, which, from being merely Roman, gradually assumes the character of an Italian literature. When at length Gallia Cisalpina had been added to the rest and Italy had extended to its natural frontiers, talented men repaired from there to a larger scene. Catullus, Cornelius Nepos, Furius Bibaculus, Cassius (of Parma) and subsequently Cornelius, Gallus and Livy are natives of Upper Italy, Varro (Atacinus) even of transalpine Gaul. Though nice ears pretended to perceive one or the other peculiarity in these 'new' Romans distinguishing them from real 'urbanitas', they certainly possessed greater vigour and zeal. The proportionally slow development of the distant parts of Italy offered, moreover, the advantage of greater independence with regard to the ever-changing fashions of the metropolis, and this again led to a faithful adherence to really classic models;[2])

[1]) Cic. orat. 48, 161 (poetae novi), ad Att. VII 2, 1 (νεώτεροι). Tusc. III 19, 45 (cantores Euphorionis). Cf. also Quintil. XII 10, 12 sqq.

[2]) Even Sueton. gramm. 24 says: in provincia .. durante adhuc ibi antiquorum memoria, necdum omnino abolita sicut Romae.

and from this source they often derived sufficient vitality to supply again the arteries of the metropolis when exhausted by its fitful restlessness.

Both the extent and the lasting influence of his literary activity secured to Cicero a central position in this period. Around him the older and younger generations may be grouped. Among those somewhat older than himself we may mention Varro (born 638), Aquilius Gallus (born c. 640), the aristocrats M. Crassus (born anterior to 639), L. Lucullus (born c. 640), Hortensius (born 640), M. Piso (born c. 642), and Atticus (born 645); also the translators of Epicurean works, L. Albucius, and perhaps even Laevius (born certainly before 640). Of the same age with Cicero are Cn. Pompey and D. Laberius (both born 648), Sulpicius Rufus, and of nearly the same age L. Lucceius, Q. Tubero, Q. Cicero (born 652) and Furius Bibaculus (born 651). Besides these, Tiro, Trebatius Testa (born c. 665) and perhaps Nigidius Figulus (praetor 696) belong to the same school. Upon the younger men Caesar (born 624) exercises much power of attraction. Among these, nearer to Cicero with regard to their ages are Lucretius (born 655), Cato Uticensis (born 659), C. Memmius (praetor 696), Cornelius Nepos (born c. 660), Valerius Cato (born c. 664), Hirtius, Oppius, Munatius Plancus, M. Calidius, C. Trebonius, Maecius Tarpa, C. Cassius, Valerius Messala. Orbilius Pupillus, though born as early as 640, only then began his career. Some even younger than these came into frequent contact with Cicero, in so far as they were adversaries of the monarchy just then rising; but they were sought by him more than they courted his favour. To these belong M. Brutus (born 669), D. Brutus (born later than 670), Calvus (born 672), and also Catullus (born 668). As concerns the party of Caesar, Cicero was in friendly intercourse with C. Matius (born c. 670) and Caelius Rufus (born 672); his relations with Asinius Pollio (born 670) are somewhat doubtful, but to Sallust (born 668) and M. Antony (born c. 671) he was decidedly hostile. The personal and political relations of Varro Atacinus (born c. 672) are not known.

The year 691, in which Cicero was consul, forms to a certain extent a turning-point in his life as well as in the relative position of the political parties. Hence we divide

the whole period into two halves and assign to the first all those writers whose principal achievements (whether literary or personal) are anterior to that year, and to the second those who flourished after 691.

THE FIRST HALF OF THE CICERONIAN PERIOD. 671—691 V. C.

152. M. Terentius Varro, born a. 638 in the Sabine town of Reate, of an ancient family of senatorial rank, from the very first devoted himself especially to the investigation of antiquarian lore and to literature, though he did not keep aloof from public life and was employed in public business (especially by Pompey) whenever a man of firm and trustworthy character was required. In the civil war also he was on the side of the republican party against Caesar, who however after his victory designated him the librarian of the collection contemplated by him; M. Antony again (711) proscribed him. He escaped the danger and, laborious to his death, reached the age of almost 90 years. Varro was a writer of marvellous fertility and versatile both in his subjects and form; we meet in him a peculiar mixture of the popular element and the most universal culture, of mirth and pedantry; he was honourable in character, sober and cheerful, devoted to the good old time, and full of Roman patriotism, but also accessible to Greek culture, without however troubling himself much about the harmony and beauty of his compositions; his humour delighted especially in fantastical and strange inventions.

1. Hieronym. in Euseb. chron. ad a. Abr. 1902 = Ol. 166, 1 = 638 V. C. = 116 B. Chr.: M. Terentius Varro filosofus et poeta nascitur. The same ad 1990 = Ol. 188, 1 = 726 = 28 B. Chr.: M. Terentius Varro filosofus prope nonagenarius moritur. He seems, therefore, to have died a. 727. He is called Reatinus by Symmachus Epist. I 2; cf. Varr. R. R. II. praef. 6. II 8, 3. 5. 6. His expressions in the Catus seem to apply to himself: mihi puero modica una fuit tunica et toga, sine fasciis calciamenta, equus sine ephippio, balneum non cotidianum, alveus rarus. He was a pupil of Stilo (137, 1) and of Antiochus of Ascalon (Cic. Acad. post. I 3, 12), like Cicero, but before him. He was a friend of Cn. Pompey (Gell. XIV 7, 2) and Atticus (Cic. ad Att. II 25, 1. Varro R. R. II 1, 25. 2, 2), but never very intimate with Cicero, owing to their different characters (Roth p. 8). Letters to him

by Cicero, ad Fam. IX 1—8. Trib. pl. (Gell. XIII 12, 6), aedil. cur. (Vitruv. II 8, 9. cfr. Plin. N. H. XXXV 14, 49). According to coins Pro Q(uaestore) of Pompey as proconsul, probably a. 678 in Spain against Sertorius (Roth p. 12, n. 21) where he served at that time (Sall. Hist. II fr. 42: haec postquam Varro in maius more rumorum accepit), certainly his lieutenant in the war against the pirates (Varro R. R. II praef. 7) and rewarded with a corona navalis (Plin. N. H. VII 30, 51), probably also in the war against Mithridates (Roth p. 17). It seems that after this he became praetor (Themist. p. 453 Dd.: *Βάρων τὴν ἐξαπέλεκυν ἦρχεν ἀρχήν*, cf. Appian. b. c. IV 47 *ἐστρατηγηκώς*) a. 695 he became a member of the commission of twenty charged with the execution of the lex Iulia agraria passed by the triumvirs (Varr. R. R. I 2, 10, cfr. Plin. N. H. VII 53). a. 705 he was in company with Afranius and Petreius lieutenant to Pompey in Spain, and after the desertion of one of his legions was obliged to surrender to Caesar (Caes. b. c. I 38. II 17—20) and seems to have had no further share in the rest of the war. a. 707 he dedicated to Caesar his Antiquitates rerum div. (Lactant. I 6, 7. Augustin. Civ. D. VII 35). He was designated librarian (Suet. Caes. 44, cf. Isid. Orig. VI 5, 1). M. Antony who, in 707 had been obliged by Caesar's order to render up an estate of Varro's he had first seized (Cic. Phil. II 40, 103) and again in 710 (ib. 41, 104 sq.), proscribed him 711; but Fufius Calenus saved his life (App. b. c. IV 47), though part of his library (Gell. III 10, 17) and his large estates were lost (at least it seems so, Roth p. 28 sq.). Val. Max. VIII 7, 3: Terentius Varro . . non annis, quibus saeculi tempus aequavit, quam stilo vivacior fuit. in eodem enim lectulo et spiritus eius et egregiorum operum cursus exstinctus est. Plin. N. H. XXIX 18: nisi M. Varronem scirem LXXXIII (L. v. Jan: LXXXVIII) vitae anno prodidisse etc. See below 153, 1. J. G. Schneider, de vita M. Ter. Varr., in his Scriptores rei rusticae I 2, p. 217 sqq. A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. VI 2 p. 1688 sq., note. K. L. Roth, On the life of M. Terentius Varro, a biographical essay; Basle 1857. 33 pp. 8. G. Boissier, Étude sur la vie et les ouvrages de . . Varron. Paris 1861.

2. General character. Cic. Brut. 15, 60: diligentissimus investigator antiquitatis. Acad. post. I 3, 9: nos in nostra urbe peregrinantes . tui libri quasi domum reduxerunt. . . tu aetatem patriae, tu descriptiones temporum, tu sacrorum iura, tu sacerdotum, tu domesticam, tu bellicam disciplinam, tu sedem regionum, locorum, tu omnium divinarum humanarumque rerum nomina, genera, officia, causas aperuisti plurimumque idem poetis nostris omninoque latinis et litteris luminis et verbis attulisti, atque ipse varium et elegans omni fere numero poema fecisti philosophiamque multis locis incohasti, ad impellendum satis, ad edocendum parum. Phil. II 41, 105. In August. civ. d. VI 2: homo omnium facile acutissimus et sine ulla dubitatione doctissimus. With a certain pique he writes ad Att. XIII 18 (a. 709): homo *πολυγραφώτατος* numquam me lacessivit (by dedicating a work to him). Quintil. X 1, 95: Terentius Varro, vir Romanorum eruditissimus. plurimos hic libros et doctissimos composuit, peritissimus linguae latinae

et omnis antiquitatis et rerum graecarum nostrarumque, plus tamen scientiae collaturus quam eloquentiae. XII 11, 24: quam multa, paene omnia, tradidit Varro! Augustin. civ. d. VI 2: M. Varro . . tametsi minus est suavis eloquio, doctrina tamen atque sententiis ita refertus est ut in omni eruditione . . studiosum rerum tantum iste doceat quantum studiosum verborum Cicero delectat. Further on: vir doctissimus undecumque Varro, qui tam multa legit ut aliquid ei scribere vacasse miremur, tam multa scripsit quam multa vix quemquam legere potuisse credamus. Sen. cons. ad Helv. 8, 1. Apulei. apol. 42 and others. Plut. Romul. 12: *Οὐάρρωνα τὸν φιλόσοφον, ἄνδρα Ῥωμαίων ἐν ἱστορίᾳ βιβλιακώτατον.*

153. The total number of the works of Varro, according to a list ultimately to be traced to himself, amounted to about 620 books, belonging to 74 different works. Of these, 6 books pseudotragoediarum, 10 poematorum in lyric and elegiac measures, 150 books of saturae Menippeae, a mixture of prose and poetry, the first, however, prevailing, and 4 books saturarum, possibly a didactic poem on a subject of natural philosophy — were in metrical form.

1. Gell. II 110, 7: tum ibi addit (M. Varro in primo librorum qui inscribuntur Hebdomades), se quoque iam duodecimum annorum hebdomadam ingressum esse (i. e. his age was more than 77 years) et ad eum diem septuaginta hebdomadas librorum (i. e. 490) conscripsisse. Auson. Profess. Burdig. 20, 9 sq.: omnis doctrinae ratio . . quantam condit sexcentis (a round number) Varro voluminibus. A list of Varro's writings which seems to have been derived from Varro's work de sua vita (Ritschl p. 69—71 = p. 549 sqq.) was given by Jerome in a letter ad Paulam (s. de vir. illustr. = script. eccl. c. 54). A lengthy quotation from it is given by Rufinus apolog. (= invectiv.) II 20. But the original list was discovered in a ms. of the Public Library at Arras in the praefatio to Origines' commentary on the Genesis, and was first published and explained by F. Ritschl, on the writings of M. Terentius Varro, Bonn 1847. 83 pp. = Rh. Mus. VI p. 481—560. A facsimile of the ms. in the index lectionum of Bonn, 1849 sq. See also J. B. Pietra, Spicilegium Solmense, Vol. III (Paris 1855) p. 311—313 (p. I sq.), and Ch. Chappuis, Sentences de M. Ter. Varron et liste de ses ouvrages d'après différents manuscrits (Paris 1856) p. 117—124, where two Paris mss. of the Homiliae in Genesim are used. (Ritschl, Rh. Mus. XII p. 149 sqq.) The list does not profess to be complete (et alia plura, quae enumerare longum est. vix medium descripsi indicem, et legentibus fastidium est) and contains 38 (or taking the libri singulares as independent work) 46 numbers (in 520 or 522 single books), which however do not include 21 known to us from other sources. Hence Ritschl (l. l. p. 545 sqq. = 65—68) fixes the whole number of Varro's works at 74, and calculates the number of books approximatively at 620.

whence we should have to assume the composition of 130 books during the last 11 or 12 years of Varro's life, which were, it is true, spent in perfect leisure. To the last part of his life belong by far the most important and extensive of his works, and to his earlier years we assign his poetical and rhetorical compositions, especially the saturae Menippeae and the logistorici (Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 554 sq. n. 11).

2. With regard to Varro's metrical compositions, we knew before the discovery of Jerome's list only epigrams on the Imagines and lives from the satirae Menippeae (hexameters and elegiac distichs). The pseudotragoediae (so according to the Paris mss.) should most likely be conceived similar to the Hilarotragoediae (see above 18, 1 and 2); Ritschl, Rh. Mus. XII p. 151 sq., and were no doubt in verse. See Riese, Varr. Sat. p. 31 sq. The poemata were, probably, short poems (verba plura modice in quandam coniecta formam, Varro ap. Non. p. 428) in the manner of those of Catullus, and to them Diomedes seems to refer, I p. 395 P. = 400, 29 K.: Varro in poetico libro. Differing from the saturae Menippeae (see n. 3) those merely called Saturae must have been in verse throughout, perhaps in the manner of Lucilius. The existence of a didactic poem by Varro de rerum natura may be presumed from Quintil. I 4, 4 (Grammar cannot be ignara philosophiae vel propter Empedoclem in Graecis, Varronem ac Lucretium in Latinis, qui praecepta sapientiae versibus tradiderunt) and Lactant. div. inst. II 12, 4 (Empedocles .. de rerum natura versibus scripsit, ut apud Romanos Lucretius et Varro; on Vellei. II 26, 2: auctores carminum Varronem ac Lucretium, see Riese, Varr. p. 50), unless, indeed, Quintilian and Lactantius after him assumed the existence of a work of this kind from the words of Cicero (Acad. post., see above 152, 2). See A. Riese, Varr. Satt. Men. p. 16.

3. On the saturae Menippeae see above 24, 3. Add Prob. on Verg. Ecl. VI 31. p. 14. 19 K.: Varro .. Menippeus .. nominatus .. a societate ingenii, quod is quoque (Menippus) omnigeno carmine satiras suas (an unhappy use of a Roman term applied to Menippus) expoliverat. Even this passage proves the mixture of prose and verse in the works of Menippus and in Varro. With regard to Varro, it is, moreover, evident from the fragments of his Satires. Besides their form, Varro's Saturae Menippeae (like some of Lucian's writings) agreed with the composition of Menippus especially in their subject-matter and the whole tone, the philosophical views of a Cynic facilitating a free treatment of the various systems and emphasizing the practical bearings of things; they agree also in the continual display of mock gravity and downright jocularity. On account of this philosophical basis of Varro's Saturae Menippeae they are, perhaps, hinted at by Cicero in the words varium et elegans omni fere numero poema (above 152, 2), although poema in the singular seems to be somewhat strangely used of a work of 150 books and comprising large portions in prose. In the fragments we meet with frequent complaints as to the departure of the period from the simplicity of the good old time, a feature connec-

ting these satires with the polemic tendencies of Lucilius' Satires. But not only the form, but also the subject-matter appears to have been a strang medley, comprising as it did erudition and practical life, mythology and history, past and present. The form frequently is a dialogue, and Varro seems to have sometimes introduced his own person (addresses Varro, Marce; cf. the titles Marcopolis, Marcipor and Bimarcus). He seems also to have introduced relations of personal events (e. g. in the Sexagessis). As concerns the order of ideas, we should probably imagine it to a certain extent like Horace's Satires, loose and desultory. Side by side with many peculiarities of popular composition (proverbs, obscenities, alliteration) we also meet with a liberal admixture of Greek, single words as well as whole lines. The metres used are of a varied character, and really omni fere numero, but treated with strict correctness. Iambic senarii prevail; besides them we have trochaics, choliambics, hexameters and distichs, anapaests; but also sotadean lines, galliambics, choriambics, hendecasyllabli, glyconeans, cretics, bacchiacs. A. Riese, Varr. reliqq. p. 55—90. Just as he often passes from Latin into Greek, he sometimes changes in the middle of a sentence from prose into verse (A. Riese in Jahn's Jahrb. 95 p. 646—648), though this is tenaciously controverted by L. Müller, esp. de re metr. lat. p. 78 sqq. The greater number of fragments have been preserved by Nonius; those of the Eumenides are most numerous. Gellius is most useful in fixing the original contents and parts of the Saturae Menippeae, hence the lists in Oehler p. 42 sqq., Vahlen p. 203 sq. and A. Riese p. 38 sqq. As a rule, the titles are strange and arbitrary (e. g. Sesqueulixes, Papiapapae, *Σκιαμαχία*, *Ἱπποκύων*, *Ὑδροκύων*), sometimes Latin and sometimes Greek, not rarely taken from a proverb (nescis quid vesper serus vehat; post vinum seplasia fetet; mutuum muli scabunt; *ἄλλος οὗτος Ἡρακλῆς, ὃς παῖδες οἱ γέροντες* and others), but certainly not twofold, Riese's suspicion (p. 26. 43 sqq. Symb. p. 481 sqq.) that the secondary titles beginning with *περί* were, like the similar ones of Plato's dialogues, added by a later grammarian, having much probability. Double titles seem to be characteristic of the Logistorici. Only of the *Τριχάρανος* the date is known (a. 694); but in 709 Cicero (Acad. I 2, 8) lets Varro call these Satires vetera sua. The fragments of the Sat. Men. collected by Fr. Oehler (Lips. 1844) and A. Riese (Lips. 1865: cf. Rhein. Mus. XX p. 401—443. XXI p. 109—122. Jahn's Jahrb. 95, p. 488—496. 507—509). Critical contributions by G. Röper (Philologus IX p. 223—278. 567—573. XV p. 267—302. XVII p. 64—102. XVIII p. 418—486. Eumenidum reliquiae, Danzig 1858. 1861. 1862), J. Vahlen (in Varr. S. M. reliquias coniectanea, Lips. 1858. 230 pp. 8. See also Ribbeck and Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. XIV p. 102—130. 419—452), C. L. Kayser (Heidelberger Jahrb. 1860, p. 241—252), L. Müller (metr. poet. lat. and Jahn's Jahrb. a. a. O.), M. Crain (Berlin, Zeitschr. für Gymn. 1866, p. 606—618), J. Mähly, Varroniana (esp. on Modius), Basel 1865. 39 pp. 4. — L. Mercklin, on the double titles of Varro's Sat. Men. and Logistorici, Rh. Mus. XII p. 372—398; cf. Philol. XIII p. 713—728. Al. Riese in the proll. to his edition and in

the Symbola philolog. Bonn. p. 479—488. Mommsen, Hist. of Rome III² p. 584—590.

154. Varro's prose-writings embraced almost all branches of knowledge and literature, eloquence, history both political and literary, jurisprudence, grammar, philosophy, geography, husbandry, etc. But in all this universal study, Varro always kept his own country and its past in steady view, and through that portion of his writings exercised an immense influence, both directly and indirectly. The Christian Fathers especially, and among them preeminently S. Augustin, read and studied him diligently. The most important prose-works of Varro which long survived in literature, were his Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum, the books de lingua latina, rerum rusticarum, the Encyclopaedia of the artes liberales (Disciplinarum libri) and his Imagines.

1. Speeches: Orationum libri XXII, and Suasionum libri III, the first probably exercises of the pen never delivered (some also pamphlets), possibly intended as laudationes (Varro's laudatio Porciae is mentioned by Cic. ad Att. XIII 48, 2); the Suasiones perhaps of a political character. Each book seems to have contained only one speech. Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 495—497. 552, n. 3.

2. *Λογιστορικῶν* libri LXXVI, discussions of philosophical (and chiefly ethic) questions (*λόγοι*) with plentiful additions of historical instances (*ἱστορίαι*) partly derived from mythology, perhaps in the manner of Heraclides of Pontus, and like Cicero's Cato and Laelius serious and popular, in prose, some of them at least in the form of dialogues. Each piece bore a twofold title, the first part of which was the name of some person, either living or dead, connected with the subject-matter and who, perhaps, was the principal speaker, the second part indicating the contents in Latin; e. g. Catus, de liberis educandis; Messala, de valetudine; Curio, de deorum cultu; Marius, de fortuna; Orestes, de insania; (Fundanius) Gallus, de admirandis; Sisenna, de historia. They were probably written after the Sat. Menippeae, at the end of the 7th and beg. of the 8th century V. C. Ritschl, ind. lect. Bonn. 1845 sq. and Rh. Mus. VI p. 501—503. 543 sq. n. 552 sq. n. 4. Riese, Varr. sat. Men. p. 32—38. 53, and the fragments (very numerous those of the Catus) ib. p. 247—259. L. Krahner, Varronis Curio de cultu deorum, Friedland 1851. 23 pp. 4. L. Mercklin, Philol. XIII p. 728—731.

3. Subjects of contemporary history: Legationum libri III and de Pompeio III, also de sua vita libri III; the first no doubt treated of Varro's own achievements as the legate of Pompey, in the war with the pirates, against Mithridates and in Spain; see 152, 1. The work

on Pompey seems to have been in defence of him. Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 498—501.

4. Works on Roman history. a) Antiquitatum libri XLI (Jerome erroneously has XLV), a system of Roman antiquities, divided into two parts according to the subject-matters, rerum humanarum in 25 books (4 parts of 6 books each, with an introductory book); then (quod prius exstiterint civitates, deinde ab eis res divinae institutae sint, August. C. D. VI 4), 16 rerum divinarum (5 parts of 3 books each, with one book to serve as introduction); see the accurate account in Augustin. de civ. dei VI 3: quadraginta unum libros scripsit Antiquitatum; hos in res humanas divinasque divisit, rebus humanis viginti quinque, divinis sedecim tribuit, istam secutus in ea partitione rationem ut rerum humanarum libros senos quattuor partibus daret. intendit enim qui agant, ubi agant, quando agant, quid agant. in sex itaque primis de hominibus scripsit, in secundis sex de locis, sex tertios de temporibus, sex quartos eosdemque postremos de rebus absolvit. quater autem seni viginti et quattuor fiunt. sed unum singularem, qui communiter prius de omnibus loqueretur, in capite posuit. in divinis identidem rebus eadem ab illo divisionis forma servata est, quantum adtinet ad ea quae diis exhibenda sunt. exhibentur enim ab hominibus in locis et temporibus sacra. haec quattuor quae dixi libris complexus est ternis: nam tres priores de hominibus scripsit, sequentes de locis, tertios de temporibus, quartos de sacris, etiam hic, qui exhibeant, ubi exhibeant, quando exhibeant, quid exhibeant, subtilissima distinctione commendans. sed quia oportebat dicere maximeque id expectabatur quibus exhibeant, de ipsis quoque diis tres conscripsit extremos, ut quinquies terni quindecim fierent. sunt autem omnes, ut diximus, sedecim, quia et istorum exordio unum singularem, qui prius de omnibus loqueretur, apposuit; quo absoluto consequenter ex illa quinquepertita distributione tres praecedentes, qui ad homines pertinent, ita subdivisit ut primus sit de pontificibus, secundus de auguribus, tertius de quindecim viris sacrorum; secundos tres ad loca pertinentes, ita ut in uno eorum de sacellis, altero de sacris aedibus diceret, tertio de locis religiosis; tres porro, qui istos sequuntur et ad tempora pertinent, id est ad dies festos, ita ut unum eorum faceret de feriis, alterum de ludis circensibus, de scaenicis tertium. quartorum trium ad sacra pertinentium uni dedit consecrationes, alteri sacra privata, ultimo publica. hanc velut pompam obsequiorum in tribus qui restant dii ipsi sequuntur extremi, quibus iste universus cultus inpensus est: in primo dii certi, in secundo incerti, in tertio cunctorum novissimo dii praecipui atque selecti. The rer. human. libri were intended to counteract the decay of the religion of the state and were addressed ad Caesarem pontificem (August. de civ. dei VII 35. Lactant. Instit. I 6, 7) and seem, therefore, to have been published about the close of 707. Of these there was also an abridgment, ἐπιτομή antiquitatum, in 9 (4 + 5) books. Priscian seems to be the last who possessed them complete. Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 506. L. H. Krahner, comm. de Varr. antiqq... libris XLI, Halle 1834; and for the tenth book of Varro's

Antiqq. rer. div., Ztschr. f. AW. 1852, p. 385—412. L. Mercklin, Philologus XIII p. 731—735. The fragments are collected and explained by R. Merkel in his edition of Ovid's Fasti p. CVI—CCXLVII. See also C. H. J. Francken, fragmenta Varr. quae inveniuntur in libris S. Augustini de civ. dei, Lugd. Bat. 1836. Lüttgert, Theologumena Varroniana, a S. Augustino in iudicium vocata, Sorau 1858. 4. L. Mercklin, de Varrone coronarum Rom. militarium interprete praecipuo, Dorpat 1859. 4.

b) Annalium libri III, probably a chronological compendium like the annales of Atticus and the chronica of Cornelius Nepos. Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 508—510.

c) de vita populi romani (comp. Dicaearchus' *Βίος Ἑλλάδος*) in 4 books, dedicated to Atticus (Charis. I p. 101 P. = 126, 25 K.), to judge from the fragments (collected by Kettner p. 21—39) a kind of history of Roman civilisation, a cleverly combined arrangement according to the subjects and chronology, I treating of the private conditions, II of family and state, III of military affairs, IV of the downfall of the state (i. e. the Republic). They were written perhaps about 711 (Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 512). H. Kettner, Varronis de vita pop. rom. . . quae exstant, Halle 1863. 42 pp.

d) de gente populi rom. 4 books; see Arnob. adv. nat. V 8: Varro . . in librorum quattuor primo quos de gente conscriptos rom. pop. dereliquit, curiosis computationibus edocet ab diluvii tempore (of Deucalion) adusque Hirti consulatum et Pansae (a. 711) annorum esse milia nondum duo. They were written a. 711 or shortly afterwards (see Arnob. l. l.) and were an attempt to bring Roman chronology in accordance with that of other parts of history, and thus to fix the pedigree of the Roman nation (Roth, Varro's Life p. 27). This genealogy was, after a chronological introduction on the Sicyonian and Athenian dynasties (I and II), carried down to the Latin (III) and Roman (IV) dynasties, great attention being paid to the ethnographic connexion of Roman institutions (Serv. Aen. VII 176). The first part of this work was much used by S. Augustin in book XVIII de civ. dei; see especially c. 2. 13. Francken, fragm. Varr. p. 124—150. H. Kettner, Studies on Varro (Halle 1865) p. 38—63, and the fragments p. 63—78.

e) de familiis troianis (families of patrician rank descended from Aeneas or his companions) in several books (Serv. Aen. V 704: Varro in libris quos de familiis troianis scripsit). See Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 507 sq. W. Hertzberg in the notes on his translation of the Aeneid V 116 sqq. p. 369.

f) Aetia (*Αἴτια*, after the example of Callimachus), explanations (of the ratio, causae, the *cur*) of Roman customs and manners, especially those of private life, most probably the principal source of Plutarch's *Αἴτια ῥωμαϊκά*. L. Mercklin, Philologus III p. 267—277. XIII p. 710 sq. G. Thilo, de Varrone Plut. Quaest. rom. auctore praecipuo, Bonn 1853. J. J. W. Lagus, Plutarchus Varronis studiosus, Helsingfors 1847. Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 512.

g) rerum urbanarum libri III, perhaps a history of the city of Rome, especially on questions of topography. Ritschl l. l. p. 510 sq. O. Jahn, Hermes II p. 235.

h) tribuum liber (quoted by Varro L. L. V 56), used in the articles concerning the tribes in Festus; see L. Mercklin, Quaestiones Varronianae (Dorpat 1852. 4.) p. 5 sqq.

All these works (b—h) form the completion and detailed explanation of the subject treated in the Antiqq. rerum humanarum, to which also belongs the *Εἰσαγωγικὸς* ad Pompeium composed as early as 683 (Pompeius cum initurus foret consulatum, Gell.) — ex quo disceret quid facere dicereque deberet cum senatum consuleret (Gell. XIV 7, 2). But the subject treated in the res divinae does not recur in a work on any detailed point, the passage Varro in augurum libris (Macrob. Sat. I 16, 19) being very doubtful (perhaps we should read libro, i. e. Antiquitatum); see Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 540.

5. Works on literary history (Ritschl l. l. p. 513—524): de bibliothecis III; de proprietate scriptorum III (perhaps on questions of style, Ritschl p. 524); de poetis (the Roman) in several books (Gell. I 24, 3: epigramma Plauti . . a M. Varrone positum in libro de poetis primo; cf. XVII 21, 43. 45); de poematis III (probably a treatise on poetic art); de lectionibus III (seems to have dealt with recitation, Ritschl p. 521 sqq.); de compositione saturarum (Non. p. 67). Dramatic literature and Plautus were especially treated by Varro in a series of works (Ritschl p. 516 sqq.). Also de originibus scenicis III; de scenicis actionibus (exhibitions) III (from Jerome; in Charis. I p. 74 P. = 95, 18 K.: Varro de actionibus scenicis V; cf. the Anonymus de generibus nominum ed. Otto, Giessen 1850. 4., n. 306); de actibus scenicis III; de personis (masks) III; de descriptionibus (characters) III; quaestionum Plautinarum V (possibly explanations of obscure expressions) and de comoediis Plautinis (perhaps on the genuine and spurious plays) several books (M. Varro in libr. de comoediis Pl. primo, Gell. III 3, 9). Servius Ae. X 894 (ut etiam Varro in ludis theatralibus docet) speaks rather of the book of the Antiqq. rer. hum. treating de ludis scenicis (see above 154, 4, a) than of the treatise de scenicis actionibus. Of special importance among the writings of Varro concerning literary history are

Imaginum libri XV or Hebdomades, illustrated biographies, published about 715 V. C. (Gell. III 10, 17), containing about 700 portraits of Greek and Roman celebrities (kings and generals, statesmen, poets, prose-writers, artists, men famous in all branches of knowledge) with a (metrical) elogium on each. The first book seems to have formed the introduction with 14 types of the classes given in the succeeding books; the other 14 books (or 7 dyads, always the even numbers for the Greeks, the odd for the Romans) would seem to have contained 49 portraits each ($14 \times 49 = 686 + 14 = 700$). Of the same Varro subsequently published a cheaper edition for the people, probably without portraits, *ἐπιτομὴν* ex Imaginum libris XV libros IIII (Jerome),

a number first changed by Ritschl (Rh. M. XII p. 160) to VII (UII), then left unaltered in his Epimetrum, 1858, and explained of 4 main categories (state, literature, art etc.). Plin. N. H. XXXV 2, 11: imaginum amorem flagrasse quondam testes sunt Atticus ille Ciceronis (see below 159, 1, d) et M. Varro benignissimo invento, insertis voluminum suorum fecunditati septingentorum inlustrium aliquo modo imaginibus. Gell. III 10, 1: M. Varro in primo librorum qui inscribuntur Hebdomades vel de imaginibus. 11, 7: M. Varro in libro de imaginibus primo Homeri imagini epigramma hoc adposuit. Symmach. Ep. I 2: scis Terentium . . Reatinum . . Hebdomadum libros epigrammatum adiectione condidisse. Auson. Mosell. 305 sqq.: forsan et insignes hominumque operumque labores (of Greek architecture) hic habuit decimo celebrata volumine Marci hebdomas. F. Creuzer, Ztschr. f. AW. 1843, nr. 133—147 = Deutsche Schriften, zur Archäologie III p. 531 sqq. Elster, in Jahn's Archiv XVIII p. 202—206. XIX p. 31—52. M. Hertz, in Gerhard's Denkmälern, Forschungen 1850, p. 142 sq. F. Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 513 sq. XII p. 153 sq. 160. XIII p. 317—319; de ordine quo Varr. Hebd. dispositae fuerint, Bonn Ind. lect. 1856 sq.; Epimetrum disput. de Varr. Hebd. libris, Bonn 1858. L. Mercklin, in the Dorpat Ind. lect. 1857, Rh. Mus. XIII p. 460 sqq. and Philologus XIII p. 742—751. XV p. 709—712. L. Urlichs, Rh. Mus. XIV p. 607—612. J. Vahlen in Jahn's Jahrb. LXXVII p. 737—746.

Some of the quotations from Varro in Pliny seem to point to the existence of treatises by him on the history of art. Ritschl, Rh. M. VI p. 520 note.

6. Works on various departments of science (Ritschl, l. l. p. 503—5).

a) Disciplinarum libri IX, the first encyclopaedia in Roman literature on the artes liberales, as they had been developed by the Greeks, viz. 1) grammatica (Wilmanns, Varr. gramm. p. 98—116. 208—218.) 2) dialectica, 3) rhetorica, 4) geometria, 5) arithmetica, 6) astrologia, 7?) musica, 8) medicina, 9) architectura, out of which grew the seven artes liberales of the Middle ages, which are, however, met with as early as S. Augustine and Martianus Capella. If we are justified in referring to the eighth book the words of Pliny N. H. XXIX 4, 65 (cunctarer in proferendo ex his remedio ni M. Varro LXXXIII vitae anno prodidisset), this work would seem to be one of Varro's latest compositions. F. Ritschl, Quaestiones Varronianae, Bonn 1845. 55 pp. 4. Cf. Rhein. Mus. VI p. 503 sq. 535. L. Mercklin, Philologus XIII p. 736—738.

b) The single departments comprised by Varro in his Discipl. were moreover again treated by him in special treatises, e. g. grammar (see e), philosophy (de forma philosophiae libri III; perhaps also a single book de philosophia, see August. civ. dei XIX 1 sqq., cf. Ritschl Rh. Mus. VI p. 503), to which (as well as to the arithmetica) belonged also the nine books de principiis numerorum which were no doubt in the Pythagorean spirit. See L. Krahner, de Varrone ex Marciani satura supplendo, c. 1: de Varronis philosophia, Friedland 1846. 4. These philosophical treatises

were undoubtedly written after Cicero's Academica, i. e. after 709 (Wilmanns, Varr. gramm. libr. p. 9). There was also a special treatise on rhetoric (Varro . . in libro III Rhetoricorum, Prisc. IX p. 872 = 489, 2 Htz.) Geometry was divided by Varro into κανονική (quae ad aures pertinet, the basis of music; see Ritschl, Quaest. Varr. p. 30 sq.) and ὀπτική (quae ad oculos pertinet, optics with ἐπιπεδομετρία and στερεομετρία, Ritschl p. 37—39), in practical application it was considered as 'gromatic' and geography (Ritschl p. 39—48). 'Gromatic' or the art and doctrine of the agrimensores was no doubt specially treated in the work de mensuris (Priscian VIII p. 818 P. = 420, 15 Htz. Ps.-Boeth. de geometr. p. 1234); see Ritschl, Rh. M. VI p. 535 sq. 554, n. 8) and perhaps also geography (Ritschl p. 555, n. 12), in which department we further have de ora maritima libri (Serv. Ae. I 108. 111. V 19. VIII 710), probably the same as the opus quod de littoralibus est (Solin. 11). But it is doubtful whether the work de valitudine tuenda mentioned by Jerome was an independent work or rather a logistoricus (Ritschl p. 502. 536).

c) Besides the libri rerum rusticarum (below 156) we have the following books of practical tendencies: de aestuariis (in libro quem de aest. feci, Varr. L. L. IX 26) on such estuaries as supply lakes for the artificial rearing of seafish, Ritschl p. 554, n. 10; the two calendars of the changes of the weather, for husbandmen and sailors: Ephemeris (rustica or agrestis), composed after 708 (Ritschl p. 533), and Ephemeridis navalis libri ad Pompeium (Non. p. 71, 19. Itin. Alex. M. 6), written c. 677 (Varro Cn. Pompeio per Hispanias militaturo librum illum Ephemeridos sub nomine elaboravit, Itin. l. l.), prognostics of navigation, briefly called libri navales by Vegetius V 11. (Ritschl p. 532 sq.) Th. Bergk, Rh. Mus. I (1842) p. 367—374.

d) de iure civili libri XV, probably denoting Roman private law; Ritschl p. 505. This is considered as a general juridical introduction and the principal source of Pomponius by F. D. Sannio, Varroniana traced in the writings of the Roman jurists, chiefly in Pomponius, Leipzig 1867, p. 134, cf. p. 211 sqq. The libri de gradibus (on the degrees of relation), mentioned by Serv. Ae. V 410, seem to treat of a similar subject. Questions of antiquarian and political interest and also grammatical points were dealt with in the Epistolicae quaestiones, in at least 8 books (Ritschl p. 537), and in the Epistulae if, indeed, they were a different work from them, in which case they were divided into graecae and latinae (Non. p. 141: Varro epistula latina; p. 121: Varro epistula latina libro I; p. 473: Varro ep. lat. libro II; cf. p. 419: Varro . . epistulis Latiniae), see Ritschl p. 537—540. 553, n. 5 sq.

e) Besides the great work de lingua latina in 25 books (below 155) and the abridgment in 9 books, the following separate treatises dealt with grammar: de antiquitate litterarum (Priscian I p. 540 P. = p. 8, 2 Htz.: Varro in II de antiquitate litterarum), addressed to the tragic poet L. Attius and one of the earliest works of Varro (Ritschl p. 529 sq. 557, n. 21. Wilmanns p. 117—125. 218—220); de origine linguae

III (perhaps dedicated to Pompey, Ritschl p. 530 sq.); περὶ χαρακτήρων (= τύπων, formation of words, Usener in Jahn's jahrb. XCV p. 247 sq.), at least 3 books (Charis. II p. 170 P. = 189, 25 K.: Varro in III π. χ.); de similitudine verborum III (= de analogia, Ritschl p. 529); de utilitate sermonis (Charis. p. 98 P. = 123, 3 K.: Varro de ut. s. IIII), laying great weight on the principle of anomalia (Ritschl p. 529); de sermone latino V (Jerome; but Rufin. p. 2707 P. = p. 379 Gaisf.: in lib. VII de lingua latina ad Marcellum, cf. Gell. XII 6, 3. 10, 4. XVI 12, 7 sq. XVIII 12, 8. Wilmanns p. 47—97. 170—208), treating also of the metres (Ritschl p. 524, cf. Westphal, On Metres p. 32 sq. 92 sq). A. Wilmanns, de Varr. libris grammaticis scripsit relliquiasque subiecit, Berlin 1864. 226 pp. 8.

To these add (libri) singulares X in Jerome, μονόβιβλα on unknown subjects (Ritschl p. 502).

155. Of all the works of Varro only two have come down to us, de lingua latina and rerum rusticarum libri III. But of the original 25 books de lingua latina only book V to X are in existence, and even those mutilated at the end of VI, VIII and X, and at the beginning of VII and IX, not to speak of numerous interpolations and corruptions. The complete work dealt, in its first half, with the formation and flexion of words, in its second with the syntax, and throughout the Alexandrine writers and Stoics were laid under large contributions. From the fifth book the work was dedicated to Cicero, whence it follows that it was written and published about 711, at the very latest. Its linguistic value is very unequal, its style uncouth and awkward.

1. The strict and mechanical symmetry of the composition in the work de lingua latina (like that of the Antiquitatum libri, see above 154, 4 a) appears from the repeated mention of it. VII 110: quoniam omnis operis de lingua latina tris feci parteis, primo quemadmodum vocabula imposita essent rebus (etymology), secundo quemadmodum ea in casus declinarentur (declension and conjugation), tertio quemadmodum coniungerentur (syntax). V 1: quemadmodum vocabula essent imposita rebus in lingua latina sex libris exponere institui. de his tris (independently of the first book which contains the introduction; thus we get books II—IV) ante hunc feci, quos Septumio misi. in quibus est de disciplina quam vocant ἐτυμολογικήν. quae contra eam dicerentur, volumine primo (b. II); quae pro ea, secundo (b. III); quae de ea, tertio (b. IV). in his ad te (Cicero) scribam, a quibus rebus vocabula imposita sint in lingua latina, et ea quae sunt in consuetudine apud poetas. VI 97: quoniam de hisce rebus tris libros ad te mittere institui, de oratione soluta duo, de poetica unum, et ex soluta ad te misi duo, priorem (b. V) de locis et quae in locis sunt. hunc (b. VI) de temporibus

et quae cum his sunt coniuncta: deinceps in proxumo (b. VII) de poeticis verborum originibus scribere institui. VII 5: dicam in hoc libro de verbis quae a poetis sunt posita, primum de locis, dein de his quae in locis sunt, tertio de temporibus, tum quae cum temporibus sunt coniuncta. VIII 24: de quibus utriusque generis (ἀναλογίας and ἀνωμαλίας) declinationibus libros faciam bis ternos: prioris tris (b. VIII, IX, X) de earum declinationum disciplina, posterioris (b. XI, XII, XIII) ex eius disciplinae propaginibus. de prioribus primus (b. VIII) erit hic: quae contra similitudinem (analogy) declinationum dicantur, secundus (b. IX), quae contra dissimilitudinem (anomaly), tertius (b. X) de similitudinum forma. de quibus quae expediero, singulis tribus; tum de alteris totidem scribere ac dividere incipiamus. The books XIV to XXV treated of syntax. See Ritschl, Rh. Mus. VI p. 525 sq. Wilmanns, de Varr. libris grammat. p. 22 sqq. The fragments of the lost books are collected by Wilmanns p. 141—170.

2. The dedication to Cicero extended from book V to XXV. Cf. Gell. XVI 8, 6: M. Varro de lingua latina ad Ciceronem quarto vicesimo; also Priscian X 50. p. 540, 4 Htz.: Varro in XXIIII ad Ciceronem. The fact of the other books being already dedicated to another would seem to prove that they were written before Varro decided to exchange with Cicero a series of dedications. As early as 707 he promised Cicero magnam et gravem προσφώνησιν (Cic. ad Att. XIII 12, 3), but did not get on as fast as Cicero finished his books, so that Cicero became impatient in 709 (biennium praeteriit cum ille Καλλιππίδης assiduo cursu cubitum nullum processerit, l. l.) and took Atticus' advice in starting himself by dedicating his Academica to Varro (ad Att. XIII 12, 3. 16, 1 sq. 18.) Varro's work was finished only after the publication of Cicero's Academica (a. 709), but no doubt before Cicero's death (close of 711). O. Müller's suspicion that the work was perhaps published in an unfinished state after Varro's death, is at variance with the fact that Varro himself published an epitome of it. See O. Müller's Praef. p. I—XI and against it L. Spengel, Trans. of the Bavarian Academy VII 2 p. 443 sqq.; Roth, the Life of Varro p. 25, and Wilmanns, Varr. libr. gramm. p. 37—46. Verrius Flaccus does not appear to have used the book, it may be because he thought little of it. See Schwegler, Rom. Hist. I p. 127 "the work abounds in nonsensical and childish etymologies, many of which violate the first elements of Latin grammar".

3. The pretty numerous mss. of the work de lingua lat. belong all of them to the 15th century except their archetype, the Medicean at Florence, Laur. 51, 10 saec. XI. C. Lachmann, Rhein. Mus. 1835, p. 104. 1845, p. 611. H. Keil, Rhein. Mus. VI (1848) p. 142—145. Editio princeps by Pomponius Laetus, Rome c. 1471. Recent editions especially by L. Spengel (Berol. 1826) and C. O. Müller (Lips. 1833); from the latter A. E. Egger (Paris 1837). Recent contributions to criticism (see L. Mercklin, Philologus XIII p. 684—692) especially by L. Spengel, on the criticism of Varro's work de l. l., Munich 1854. 4. (Trans. of the Bavarian Academy VII 2 p. 429—482); de emendanda ratione librorum de

l. l., Munich 1858. 4; Philol. XVII p. 288—306. W. Christ, Philol. XVI p. 450—464. XVII p. 59—63. H. Kettner, Critical observations on Varro and Latin glossaries, Rossleben 1867. 4. For the explanation of the subject see L. Lersch, on the linguistic philosophy of the ancients III p. 169 sqq. C. E. L. Oxe, de Varr. etymis quibusdam, Kreuznach 1859. 4. A. Wilmanns, de Varr. libr. gramm. p. 1—46.

156. Varro's three books rerum rusticarum we have complete, with the exception of a gap at the beginning of the second book. The first treats of agriculture, the second of cattle, the third of birds and fish bred on the estate. Erudition and a long practical experience furnished the author (who was then 80 years old) with rich materials. The whole is dressed up as a dialogue, in the manner of Cicero's philosophical writings, but far more graphic in scenery and action; Varro largely availing himself of this opportunity to display his somewhat pedantic, bnt thoroughly kindly wit in puns on the names of his characters.

1. R. R. I 1, 1: annus octogesimus admonet me ut sarcinas colligam ante quam proficiscar e vita. It was, therefore, written a. 717. The dialogue is supposed to take place in b. II in 687 (April 21st), in book III in 700; see II praef. 7. III 2, 3 (cf. Cic. ad Att. IV 15, 5). Ibid. I 1, 4: scribam tibi (his wife Fundania) tres libros indices. This remained, though books II and III were dedicated to others, the first to Turranius Niger, the second to Q. Pinnius. I 1, 11: quo brevius (on account of the great number of predecessors) de ea re conor tribus libris exponere, uno de agricultura, altero de re pecuaria, tertio de villaticis pastionibus. II praef. 6: quoniam de agricultura librum Fundaniae uxori propter eius fundum feci, tibi, Niger Turrani noster, qui vehementer delectaris pecore, .. de re pecuaria breviter ac summatim percurram. III 1, 9: cum putarem esse rerum rusticarum .. tria genera, unum de agricultura, secundum de pecuaria ad Turranium Nigrum. qui reliquus est tertius, de villaticis fructibus, hunc ad te (Q. Pinnius) mitto, quod visus sum debere pro nostra vicinitate et amore scribere potissimum ad te. Just as this continual repetition of the arrangement of the work is characteristic of Varro, so we have in this work also a frequent recurrence of his complaints of the loss of ancient simplicity of manners. For the puns on proper names (Fundania, Fundilius, Agrasius, Agrius, Stolo, Scrofa, Vaccius, Merula, Passer, Pavo and others) see A. Schleicher, Melet. Varr. spec. I (Bonn 1846) p. 1—12.

2. The gap after the praef. of book II being found in all mss., they are all derived from the same source. This was no doubt the Cod. Marcianus, orig. at Florence, now lost, which was used by P. Victorius. The best copy of it is Laur. 51, 4, written between 1420 and 1430. A. Schleicher, Melet. Varr. I p. 13 sqq. (p. 20—32 index codicum) and

especially H. Keil, Observationes criticae in Catonis et Varronis de re rustica libros, Halle 1849. Cf. L. Mercklin, Philologus XIII p. 694—698. The text in the Scriptores rei rusticae (see above 44, 2) and in the opera Varronis (see 157, 3). A. Frémy, quid in libris M. T. V. de re rustica ad litteras attineat, Paris 1843. (diss.).

157. The other works of Varro do not seem to have been in existence beyond the sixth century of the Christian era. Among the so-called sententiae Varronis there are not a few which may really have been derived from Varro's writings.

1. On the relation of Marcianus Capella to Varro see Ztsch. f. Ald. 1845 p. 1126 sqq. Jahn's Archiv XIII p. 590 sqq. Krahner, de Varrone ex Marciani satura supplendo, Friedland 1846. 4. That Isidore Hisp. does not derive the 36 passages in which he mentions Varro from Varro, but from other authorities, has partly been proved, partly been rendered highly probable by H. Kettner, Studies on Varro (Halle 1865) p. 2—37. From this circumstance we seem justified in drawing the conclusion that the age of Isidore, i. e. the seventh century A. D., possessed no more of Varro than we have. This appears more credible, if indeed, ut traditur a maioribus (Joh. Saresber. Policrat. II 26. VIII 19), Pope Gregory I (590—604) burnt a whole collection of classical works on the Palatine. Petrarch, in a letter addressed to Varro (Oct. 1, 1343) gives vent to the hope hitherto unfulfilled: divinarum et humanarum rerum libros XLI, qui nomen tibi sonantius pepererunt, hos adhuc alicubi forsitan latitare suspicor, eaque multos iam per annos me fatigat cura. Roth, Varro's life p. 4 sq. note.

2. The Sententiae Varronis, about 160 (printed e. g. in A. Riese, Varr. Satt. p. 265—272), appear in the mss. under various titles (Sententiae Varronis ad Papirianum Athenis audientem; Proverbia Varronis ad Paxianum; Sententiae Varronis ad Atheniensem auditorem morales atque notabiles; Varro ad Atheniensem auditorem; Liber moralis quem Varro scripsit ad Ath. aud.; Varro in Moralibus or in libro Moralium). We cannot but agrèe with Riese's judgment (l. l. p. X sq.): non absonum puto conicere aliqua certe ex parte eas e Varronis libris derivandas esse. nam insunt sententiae quales liberaliòr tantum excultiorque medio aevo aetas invenire potuit quaeque Varronis ingenio aptissimae sunt (e. g. 1: di essemus ni moreremur. 4: cum natura litigat qui mori grave fert. 10: in multis contra omnes sapere desipere est. 37: eo vultu dimittendae sunt divitiae quo accipiendae. 39: philosophiae non accommodari tempus, sed dari oportet; ipsa enim praecipuus est dei cultus. 62: eo tantum studia intermittantur ne omittantur. 84: nil novit qui aeque omnia. 85: cito transcursa citius labuntur. 86: sic multi libros degustant ut convivae delicias. 151: sic studendum ut propter id te putes natum; it is true that all these sayings remind us even more of Seneca). nec obstat sermo, qui profecto illius aevi barbarie foede infectus est, cum in talibus flori-

legiis sententias tantum respicere, verba neglegere suoque usui accommodare possent. Thus 56 (omnia nosse impossibile) agrees with Varr. R. R. II 1, 3 (nemo omnia potest scire). Some are metrical or easily got into metre (e. g. 9. 21. 84. 98. 101), whence it is probable that Varro's saturae may have been especially used for this collection. Mercklin suspected the obscure grammarian Varro (ap. Vergilium Mar. de VIII partibus or.) in the Carolingian time of being their author. In the medieval encyclopaedias (e. g. Vincentius Bellovacensis' Speculum historiale and doctrinale, Arnoldi de Hollandia Liber Vaticani) these sentences were much used. See Sententias M. T. V. . . edidit et commentario illustravit Vinc. Devit, Padua 1843. R. Klotz, on the sentences attributed to Varro, Jahn's Archiv IX p. 582—603. Düntzer, ibid. XV p. 193 sqq. cf. Jahn's Jahrb. XIV p. 135 sqq. L. Mercklin, Philologus II p. 480—483. XIII p. 739—742. Quicherat, pensées inédites de Varron, Bibl. de l'école des chartes III 1. (Paris 1849) p. 3 sqq. Sentences de M. T. V. et liste de ses ouvrages, d'après différents manuscripts, par Ch. Chappuis, Paris 1856, p. 1—116. Ritschl, Rhein. Mus. XII p. 147—149.

3. There is as yet no trustworthy collection and explanation of the whole of Varro's writings, as far as extant. Of old works we mention: Varronis opera cum notis J. Scaligeri, A. Turnebi all., Paris 1569. 1573. 1581. 1585. By Ausonius Popma, Lugd. Bat. 1601. Dortrecht 1619. Amsterdam 1623. Editio Bipontina 1788. 2 Voll.

158. The most eminent orator of the aristocratic party was Q. Hortensius Hortalus (a. 640—704 V. C.), as a man soft to effeminacy, as an orator long the most prominent on account of his powerful memory and elaborate elocution, until Cicero surpassed him. He also distinguished himself in literature, not only by publishing part of his speeches, but also by writing a treatise on general questions of eloquence, besides Annales and erotic poems. Besides him, we may mention the following orators of the aristocratic party: the triumvir M. Licinius Crassus (a. 638—701), L. Licinius Lucullus (a. 640—698), M. Pupius Piso Calpurnianus (Cons. 693), as well as Cn. Pompeius Magnus (a. 648—706) and several others.

1. Hortensius was aedile 679, Praetor 682, Cons. 685, † 704, according to Seren. Sammon. 261 sqq. of an affection of the throat. Cic. Brut. 88, 301: (erat Hortensius) primum memoria tanta quantam in nullo cognovisse me arbitror (see a specimen in Sen. Controv. I. praef. 19. p. 54, 3 sqq. Bu.), ut quae secum commentatus esset, ea sine scripto verbis eisdem redderet quibus cogitavisset. . . 302: attuleratque minume volgare genus dicendi, duas quidem res quas nemo alius, partitiones, quibus de rebus dicturus esset, et collectiones eorum quae essent dicta contra quaeque ipse dixisset. . . 303: vox canora et suavis,

motus et gestus etiam plus artis habebat quam erat oratori satis. 95, 326: Hortensius genere (orationis asiatico) florens clamores faciebat adolescens. habebat enim et Meneclinum illud studium crebrarum venustrarumque sententiarum . . et erat oratio cum incitata et vibrans tum etiam accurata et polita. 327: erat excellens iudicio volgi et facile primas tenebat adolescens. . . sed cum iam honores et illa senior auctoritas gravius quiddam requireret, remanebat idem nec decebat idem; quodque exercitationem studiumque dimiserat, quod in eo fuerat acerrimum, concinnitas illa crebritasque sententiarum . . vestitu illo orationis quo consueverat ornata non erat. Quintil. XI 3, 8: diu princeps orator, aliquando aemulus Ciceronis existimatus est, novissime, quoad vixit, secundus. To Cicero he always behaved with kindness and ungrudging recognition, though he was often misjudged by his sensitive rival.

2. Among the numerous speeches delivered by Hortensius in the course of 44 years, we know the subjects of 26; see Luzac p. 119—146. Meyer, orat. rom. p. 168—172 = p. 361—378 ed. II. His speeches were published (e. g. pro Verre, Quintil. X 1, 23): Cic. Brut. 94, 324 (dicendi genus quod fuerit in utroque orationes utriusque etiam posteris nostris indicabunt). 96, 328 (id declarat totidem quot dixit, ut aiunt, scripta verbis oratio). or. 37, 132 (dicebat melius quam scripsit). Quintil. XI 3, 8 (actione valuisse plurimum . . fides est quod eius scripta tantum intra famam sunt, . . ut appareat placuisse aliquid eo dicente quod legentes non invenimus). Also Quintil. II 1, 11: loci . . quibus quaestiones generaliter tractantur, quales sunt editi a Q. quoque Hortensio, ut Sitne parvis argumentis credendum? cf. ib. 4, 27. Priscian VIII p. 792 P. = 381, 10 Htz. Vellej. II 16, 3 (maxime dilucide Q. Hortensius in Annalibus suis rettulit). Cic. ad Att. XII 5, 3 (de bono auctore Hortensio sic acceperam; cf. XIII 32, 3 ex Hortensio audieram; 33, 3 non temere dixit Hortensius). For his erotic poems see Plin. Ep. V 3, 5 (above 26, 1). Ovid. Trist. II 441 (nec minus Hortensi nec sunt minus improba Servi carmina). Gell. XIX 9, 7 (above 26, 1). Varr. L. L. VIII 14 (Ortensius in poematis: cervix). Catull. 95, 3 sq. In general see L. C. Luzac, de Q. H. oratore Ciceronis aemulo, Lugd. Bat. 1810. 161 pp. Linsén, de H. oratore Cic. aemulo, Abo 1822 sq. 4. W. Drumann, Hist. of Rome III p. 81—108. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. III (1843) p. 1497—1593.

3. Cic. Brut. 64, 230: Hortensius . . suos inter aequalis M. Pisonem (n. 5), M. Crassum, Cn. Lentulum (Cons. 682), P. Lentulum Suram (Cons. 683) longe praestitit. Tac. dial. 37: ex his (i. e. vetera quae et in antiquariorum bybliothecis adhuc manent et cum maxime a Muciano contrahuntur ac iam . . edita sunt) intellegi potest Cn. Pompeium (n. 6) et M. Crassum non viribus modo et armis sed ingenio quoque et oratione valuisse, Lentulos (n. 7) et Metellos (n. 8) et Lucullos (n. 4) et Curiones (see 131, 12. 140, 6 and the trib. pleb. of a. 704) et ceteram procerum manum multum in his studiis operae curaeque posuisse. Of these, M. Licinius P. f. Crassus Dives was more than 60 years old

in 699 (Plut. Crass. 17), Praetor 682, Cos. 684 and 699, Censor 689, a member of the first triumvirate 694, and fell in the expedition against the Parthians, June 8, 701; see W. Drumann, Hist. of Rome IV p. 71—115. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. IV p. 1064—1068, nr. 29. Cic. Brut. 66, 233: mediocriter a doctrina instructus, angustius etiam a natura, labore et industria . . in principibus patronis aliquot annos fuit. This is exaggerated by Plut. Crass. 3: *παιδείας τῆς περὶ λόγον μάλιστα μὲν τὸ ῥητορικὸν καὶ χρειῶδες εἰς πολλοὺς ἤσκησε, καὶ γενόμενος δεινὸς εἰπεῖν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα Ῥωμαίων ἐπιμελείᾳ καὶ πόνῳ τοὺς εὐφυεστάτους ὑπερέβαλεν.*

4. For L. Lucullus see above 144, 2. His brother, M. Licinius Lucullus, after his adoption (by M. Terentius Varro) M. Terentius M. f. Licinianus Varro, Cons. 681 (see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. IV p. 1074 sq. nr. 9), is mentioned by Cicero (Brut. 62, 222) next to M. Octavius Cn. f. and Cn. Octavius M. f. (Cons. 678) amongst political orators.

5. Cic. Brut. 67, 236: M. Piso (Cons. 693) quidquid habuit habuit ex disciplina, maximeque ex omnibus qui ante fuerunt graecis doctrinis eruditus fuit. habuit a natura genus quoddam acuminis, quod etiam arte limaverat, quod erat in reprehendendis verbis versutum et sollers (cf. ad Att. I 13, 2). . . is cum satis floruisset (as an orator) adolescens, minor haberi est coeptus postea; deinde ex Virginum iudicio (a. 681?) magnam laudem est adeptus et ex eo tempore . . tenuit locum tam diu quam ferre potuit laborem. Ascon. on Cic. in Pis. p. 15: Pupius Piso eisdem temporibus quibus Cicero, sed tanto aetate maior ut adolescentulum Ciceronem pater ad eum deduceret, quod in eo . . multae inerant litterae. Cic. fin. V 1, 1: cum audissem (at Athens) Antiochum, ut solebam, cum M. Pisone. de deor. nat. I 7, 16: M. Piso si adesset, the Peripatetic School also would be represented. ad Att. XIII 19, 4 (a. 709, when Piso was already dead): confeci V libros *περὶ τελῶν*, ut . . *περιπατητικά* M. Pisoni darem. de or. I 22, 104: est apud M. Pisonem . . Peripateticus Staseas.

6. Cn. Pompeius Magnus, born 30 Sept. 648, Cons. 684, 699 and (sine collega) 702, triumvir 694, † 29 Sept. 706; cf. W. Drumann, Hist. of Rome IV p. 324—556. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. V p. 1848—1854. According to Tac. dial. 37 (see n. 3) there were written speeches by him in existence. Cic. Brut. 68, 239: maiorem dicendi gloriam habuisset nisi eum maioris gloriae cupiditas ad bellicas laudes abstraxisset. erat oratione satis amplus, rem prudenter videbat; actio vero eius habebat et in voce magnum splendorem et in motu summam dignitatem. Vellej. II 29, 3: sanctitate praecipuus, eloquentia medius. Quintil. XI 1, 36: Pompeius abunde disertus rerum suarum narrator. Plut. Pompei. 1: *πιθανότης λόγου*. A letter by him from the beginning of the civil war (a. 705) in Cic. ad Att. VIII 11 and 12.

7. The Lentuli mentioned by Tac. dial. 37 are no doubt the same as those spoken of by Cic. Brut. 64, 230 (see n. 3), of whom Cn.

Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus ib. 66, 234 and the Catilinarian P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura ib. 235 are described as orators (cf. ib. 90, 308 Lentuli duo). Besides Cn. (Cornelius) Lentulus Marcellinus (Cons. 698) ib. 70, 247; P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther (Cons. 687) and L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus (Cons. 705) ib. 77, 268.

8. For the Metelli mentioned by Tac. dial. 37 (n. 3) cf. Cic. Brut. 70, 247: duo Metelli, Celer (Cons. 694, see A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. II p. 26 sq., nr. 15) et Nepos (Cons. 697; see Haakh l. l. p. 27—29, nr. 16), non nihil in causis versati, nec sine ingenio nec indocti. ad Att. VI 3, 10 (a. 704): orationem Q. Celeris mihi velim mittas contra M. Servilium. See ad Fam. V 4, 2.

9. For L. Lucceius see 159, 4.

10. Other orators of this period, of whom it is not, however, related that their speeches were published, are mentioned by Cicero in his Brutus 67, 237 (P. Murena, C. Censorinus, L. Turius). 68, 239 (C. Piso, M'. Glabrio, L. Torquatus). 240 (D. Silanus, Q. Pompeius A. f. Bithynicus). 241 (P. Autronius, L. Octavius Reatinus, C. Staienus). 69, 242 (C. and L. Caepasii, C. Cosconius Calidianus, Q. Arrius). 70, 245 (T. Torquatus T. f., doctus vir ex Rhodia disciplina Molonis). 246 (M. Pontidius; M. Valerius Messala, Cons. 693). Erucius, the accuser of Sex. Roscius (see below 166, nr. 2), is called Antoniaster (i. e. a stupid imitator of the orator Antonius) by Cic. p. Varen. fr. 8 p. 443 = 230 Or.

159. In the department of historical composition among the older contemporaries of Cicero especially his friend T. Pomponius Atticus (645—722) was distinguished, principally by his Annalis, a synchronistic Roman history in the somewhat meagre form of tables. Besides him, we meet with Procilius, Hortensius, Lucceius, Sulpicius, L. Tubero and others inferior to them.

1. T. Pomponius Atticus, subsequently to his adoption by Q. Caecilius Q. f. Pomponianus Atticus, a banker and publisher well-known through Cicero's correspondence with him (below 171, 2) and the panegyric biography by Cornelius Nepos. J. G. Hulleman, diatribe in T. Pomp. Att., Utrecht 1838. G. Boissier in Cicéron et ses amis (Paris 1865). W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. I 2 p. 2094—2096. His writings were: a) unus liber graece confectus, de consulatu Ciceronis (Cornel. Nep. Att. 18, 6 cf. Cic. ad Att. II 1, 1 a. 694: tuus puer . . mihi litteras abs te et commentarium consulatus mei graece scriptum reddidit).

b) Annalis. Cic. Brut. 3, 13 sq.: salutatio . . illius libri quo me hic (Atticus) affatus . . excitavit. . . quo omnem rerum (nostrarum is added by O. Jahn from 5, 19; see, however, also or. 34, 120) memoriam breviter et . . perdiligenter complexus est. 4, 15: . . ut ex-

plicatis ordinibus temporum uno in conspectu omnia viderem. 5, 19: eis (by Cicero's work de rep. of a. 700) . . ad veterum rerum nostrarum memoriam comprehendendam . . incensi sumus (Atticus). See ib. 10, 42. 11, 44 (te, quem rerum rom. auctorem laudare possum religiosissimum). 18, 72. 19, 74. orat. 34, 120: quem laborem (to learn not only Roman history sed etiam imperiosorum populorum et regum illustrium) nobis Attici nostri levavit labor, qui conservatis notatisque temporibus . . annorum septingentorum memoriam uno libro colligavit. ad Att. XII 23, 2: scriptum est in tuo Annali. Cf. Cornel. Nep. Hann. 13, 1 and Ascon. on Cic. in Pis. p. 13 (Atticus in Annali). Schol. Ver. on Aen. II 717. Solin. Polyh. 2. C. L. Roth, hist. lat. p. 382—385. Cornel. Nep. Att. 18, 1 sq.: summus . . fuit . . antiquitatis amator; quam adeo diligenter habuit cognitam ut eam totam in eo volumine exposuerit quo magistratus ordinavit. nulla enim lex neque pax neque bellum neque res illustris est populi rom. quae non in eo suo tempore sit notata, et . . sic familiarum originem subtexuit ut ex eo clarorum virorum propagines possimus cognoscere. c) ib. 18, 3 sq.: fecit hoc idem separatim in aliis libris, ut M. Bruti rogatu Iuniam familiam a stirpe ad hanc aetatem ordine enumeraverit (though for this purpose it was necessary to invent much or to adopt many family fictions to the disadvantage of historical criticism; see above 70, 2. 71, 1. 3), notans qui a quoque ortus quos honores quibusque temporibus cepisset. pari modo Marcelli Claudii de Marcellorum, Scipionis Cornelii et Fabii Maximi Fabiorum et Aemiliorum. This proves that in Atticus the desire to oblige a friend was stronger than his zeal for historical truth.

d) Imagines. Plin. N. H. XXXV 2, 11: imaginum amorem flagrasse quondam testes sunt Atticus ille Ciceronis edito de iis volumine et M. Varro. Nep. Att. 18, 5 sq.: attigit quoque poeticen . . namque versibus qui honore rerumque gestarum amplitudine ceteros rom. populi praestiterunt exposuit ita ut sub singulorum imaginibus facta magistratusque eorum . . quaternis quinisque versibus descripserit.

2. Cic. ad Att. II 2, 2 (a. 694): Dicaearchus . . a quo multo plura didiceris quam de Procilio. Varro L. L. V 148 (a Procilio relatum). 154 (ut Procilius aiebat). Plin. N. H. VIII 2, 4. XII ind. Ps. Ascon. on Cic. Verr. p. 171 Or.: legimus de Oppio et Procilio.

3. For the annals of Q. Hortensius see 158, 2. For Lucullus' history of the Marsian war see 144, 2.

4. Cic. ad Fam. V 12, 1 (a. 698) to L. Lucceius Q. f.: genus scriptorum tuorum . . vicit opinionem meam . . ut cuperem quam celerrime res nostras monumentis commendari tuis. (2.) . . videbam italici belli et civilis historiam iam a te paene esse perfectam, dixeras autem mihi te reliquas res ordiri. (3.) . . gratiam illam de qua . . in quodam prooemio scripsisti. According to Ascon. p. 92 sq., who styles him (orator) paratus eruditusque, he delivered and published a. 690 orationes in Catilinam. These may be the 'scripta' which pleased Cicero and made him

desirous to see his consulship treated by him, which Lucceius never carried out, though he had almost promised to do so. A letter by him to Cicero (a. 709) is found ad Fam. V 14. See W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. IV p. 1156 sq. nr. 3.

5. Cic. ad Att. XIII 30, 3 (a. 709): in Libonis Annali (II?) quattuordecim annis post praetor est factus Tuditanus quam consul Mummius. 32, 3: eum (Tuditanus) video in Libonis (II?) praetorem. This might be the same Libo to whom Varro dedicated a work in several books (Varro ad Libonem primo, Macrob. [II 14 =] III 18, 13), viz. his own and Pompey's friend L. Scribonius Libo (Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. IV 1 p. 881 sq. nr. 13). If so, Appianus' words b. c. III 77 *ὧδε μέν τισι περὶ τοῦ Βάσσου δοκεῖ, Λίβωνι δ' ὅτι*, would have to be understood of some one else, the events there related belonging to the year 710 and rather leading to the conclusion that the person in question was an adherent of Caesar.

6. Cornel. Nep. Hann. 13, 1: quibus consulibus interierit (Hann.) non convenit. namque Atticus (mentions a. 571) .. at Polybius (a. 572) .. Sulpicius autem Blitho (a. 573).

7. L. (Aelius) Tubero, the friend and brother-in-law of M. Cicero, a. 693—696 lieutenant to Q. Cicero in Asia. See W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. I 1 p. 335 sq. nr. 6. Cic. p. Lig. 4, 10: homo cum ingenio tum etiam doctrina excellens. ad Q. fr. I 1, 3, 10 (a. 694): legatos habes .. de quibus honore et dignitate et aetate praestat Tubero, quem ego arbitror, praesertim cum scribat historiam, multos ex suis annalibus posse deligere quos velit et possit imitari. It is doubtful whether this history was completed and published or descended to his son Q. Tubero as a mere collection of materials. The first supposition is scarcely justified by the plural *Αἴλιοι* in Dionys. Hal. Ant. I 7 (above 32, 3) Like Cicero, Tubero adhered especially to the (New) Academy, and the Sceptic Aenesidemus addressed to him his *Πυῤῥώνειοι λόγοι* (Phot. Bibl. 212. I p. 169 Bk.).

160. In the popular treatment of philosophical subjects in Latin, Cicero was preceded by Amafinius, Rabirius and Catius, but all three confined themselves to the Epicurean system, without any ornament of style, and faithfully copied from Greek sources, not altogether unsuccessfully.

1. Cicero's statements as to these predecessors of his betray little candour of judgment. Acad. post. I 2, 5: vides ipse .. non posse nos Amafinii aut Rabirii similes esse, qui nulla arte adhibita de rebus ante oculos positis volgari sermone disputant. nihil definiunt, nihil partiuntur, nihil apta interrogatione concludunt, nullam denique artem esse nec dicendi nec disserendi putant. (6.) iam vero physica, si Epicurum, i. e. si Democritum, probarem, possem scribere ita plane ut Amafinius. quid est enim magnum .. de corpusculorum (ita enim appellat atomos)

concursione fortuita loqui? Tusc. I 3, 6: multi iam esse libri latini dicuntur scripti inconsiderate ab optimis illis quidem viris sed non satis eruditis. fieri autem potest ut recte quis sentiat et id quod sentit polite eloqui non possit . . nec delectatione aliqua allicere lectorem. . . itaque suos libros ipsi legunt cum suis, nec quisquam attingit praeter eos qui eandem licentiam scribendi sibi permitti volunt. II 3, 7: est quoddam genus eorum qui se philosophos appellari volunt, quorum dicuntur esse latini sane multi libri, quos non contemno equidem, quippe quos numquam legerim; sed quia profitentur ipsi illi . . se neque distincte neque distribute neque eleganter neque ornate scribere, lectionem sine ulla delectatione neglego. IV 3, 6: C. Amafinius exstitit dicens, cuius libris editis commota multitudo contulit se ad eam potissimum disciplinam. (7.) post Amafinium multi eiusdem aemuli rationis multa cum scripsissent Italiam totam occupaverunt . . et facile ediscuntur et ab indoctis probantur.

2. Rabirius is not mentioned except Acad. I 2, 5 (see n. 1) and should not be identified with the poet C. Rabirius.

3. Cic. ad Fam. XV 16, 1 (a. 709): Catius Insuber (see below 185, 1), Epicureus, qui nuper est mortuus, quae ille Gargettius (Epicure) et iam ante Democritus εἴδωλα, hic spectra nominat. 19, 2: Epicurus, a quo omnes Catii et Amafinii, mali verborum interpretes, proficiscuntur. Quintil. X 1, 124: in Epicureis levis quidem sed non iniucundus tamen auctor est Catius. Porphyr. on Hor. Sat. II 4 (p. 292 H.): Catius Epicureus fuit qui scripsit quattuor libros de rerum natura et de summo bono. ib. Acro on v. 48 (p. 287 H.): irridet eum qui de opere pistorio in libro scripsit Catius Miltiades; where Cruquius has: irridet eum quod de op. pist. in suo libro scribit de se ipso: haec primus invenit et cognovit Catius Miltiades. See W. Teuffel, Comm. on Hor. Sat. II p. 114—116. In some of the headings of the Satire the speaker is called M. Catius (Cacius): see Hauthal's Schol. p. 280; in Pliny, Ep. IV 28, 1 he is called T. Catius.

161. In point of solidity of character, the jurist C. Aquilius Gallus was a worthy pupil of the Pontifex Q. Scaevola, and his indifference to political life is characteristic both of the increasing aversion to that kind of life and the elevation of jurisprudence to an independent study then commencing. His pupil, Servius Sulpicius Rufus (649—711), far surpassed him in manysided fertility; he was of a peaceful nature, averse to extremes, distinguished as an orator, respected as a scholar, nor a stranger to poetry, but his chief eminence consisted in his legal knowledge and in his numerous writings, by which he secured to himself a long-abiding influence on the development of jurisprudence. Jurists of the same period were P. Orbius and Precianus; C. Furius Camillus, too, was at least well-versed in legal matters.

1. Plin. N. H. XVII 1: multo pulcherrima domus consensu omnium in colli Viminali C. Aquilli equitis rom., clarioris illa quam iuris civilis scientia. Praetor 688 with Cicero, † before 710; see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. I 2 p. 1388 sq. nr. 9. Cic. p. Caecin. 27, 78 (a. 685): iuris civilis rationem numquam ab aequitate seiunxit, tot annos ingenium, laborem, fidem suam populo rom. promptum . . praebuit, . . ita iustus est et bonus vir ut natura, non disciplina consultus esse videatur, ita peritus ac prudens ut ex iure civili non scientia solum quaedam verum etiam bonitas nata videatur. Brut. 42, 154: Galli, hominis acuti et exercitati, promptam et paratam in agendo et in respondendo celeritatem. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 42: ex quibus (the auditores Mucii) Gallum maximae auctoritatis apud populum fuisse Servius dicit. See above 141, 3. Ulpian also knew him only at second hand (Dig. XIX 1, 17, 6: Gallus Aquilius, cuius Mela refert opinionem, recte ait), and in the Digest where he is mentioned perhaps a dozen times, we never find a definite title quoted. It is, therefore, possible that these quotations should be traced back to assertions made by his pupil Sulpicius Rufus as to oral responsa of Aquilius. Some legal forms are the only things which we know with certainty that Aquilius himself left in writing: e. g. especially the Aquiliana stipulatio et acceptilatio (Inst. III 29, 2. Dig. XLVI 4, 18, 1), the formula for legacies to posthumous grandchildren (Dig. XXVIII 2, 29 pr.), and formulae de dolo malo from the time of his praetorship, (Cic. off. III 14, 60. 15, 61. deor. nat. III 30, 74). Majansius, ad XXX ict. comm. II p. 57—126. Heineccius, de C. Aquillio Gallo icto celeberrimo, Opusc. II p. 777 sqq. S. W. Zimmern, History of Roman private Law I 1 p. 287 sq.

2. Ser. Sulpicius Q. f. Rufus, of about the same age with Cicero (aetates vestrae . . nihil aut non fere multum differunt, Cic. Brut. 40, 150), praetor 689, consul (after he had been repulsed in 692) 703, appointed proconsul of Achaia 708 by Caesar, † 711 on his way to Mutina. A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. VI 2 p. 1497 sq. n. 41. Originally Rufus had studied rhetoric together with Cicero, and not until a. 677 had he despaired to rival him, upon which he turned his principal attention to jurisprudence, in which he caused a methodical advance by his many-sided culture. Cic. Brut. 41, 152 sq.: existumo iuris civilis magnum usum . . apud multos fuisse, artem (method) in hoc uno. quod numquam effecisset ipsius iuris scientia, nisi praeterea didicisset . . dialecticam. 12, 153: sed adiunxit etiam et litterarum scientiam et loquendi elegantiam, quae ex scriptis eius, quorum similia nulla (volumina multa Koch) sunt, facillume perspici potest. (154.) cumque discendi causa duobus peritissumis operam dedisset, L. Lucilio Balbo (above 141, 3) et C. Aquilio Gallo, Galli . . celeritatem subtilitate diligentiaque superavit, Balbi . . tarditatem vicit expediendis conficiendisque rebus. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 43: institutus a Balbo Lucilio, instructus autem maxime a Gallo Aquilio, qui fuit Cercinae. itaque libri complures eius (sc. Rufi) exstant Cercinae confecti. . . huius volumina complura exstant (as late as the time of Pompey). reliquit autem prope CLXXX libros. Brutus ap. Cic. Brut. 42, 156: audivi nuper (a. 707) eum (Sulp.

Rufus) studiose et frequenter Sami, cum ex eo ius nostrum pontificium, qua ex parte cum iure civili coniunctum esset, vellem cognoscere. For his correspondence with Varro: Ser. Sulpicius, iuris civilis auctor, vir bene litteratus, scripsit ad M. Varronem. . . Varro rescripsit etc. Gell. II 10, 1 sq.

3. As a specimen of Rufus' rhetorical culture we may quote his letter of condolence to Cicero over the death of Tullia (a. 709): ad Fam. IV 5; his relation of the death of M. Marcellus (ib. IV 2, a. 709) is a pattern of an historical account. Quintil. X 1, 116: Ser. Sulpicius insignem non immerito famam tribus orationibus meruit. 7, 30: feruntur aliorum quoque (besides Cicero's commentarii, sketches of orations) et inventi forte, ut eos dicturus quisque composuerat, et in libros digesti, ut causarum quae sunt actae a Ser. Sulpicio, cuius tres orationes (completed and published by himself) exstant. sed hi de quibus loquor commentarii ita sunt exacti ut ab ipso (Sulp.) mihi in memoriam posteritatis videantur esse compositi (different from Cicero's commentarii which were edited by Tiro). Of these tres orationes Quintil. (IV 2, 106, cfr. X 1, 22 and Festus p. 153 M.) names one pro Aufidia, and another, in a law-suit on a legacy, contra Aufidiam (VI 1, 20), if indeed both be not identical and the error due to a slip of memory on Quintilian's part. It is not known whether the speech against Murena (a. 691) was one of these published speeches. In general see Meyer, orator. rom.[2] p. 398—402; and above 36, 9. — Quintil. X 5, 4: et illa ex latinis conversio multum et ipsa contulerit. ac de carminibus quidem (turning Latin poems into prose) neminem credo dubitare, quo solo genere exercitationis dicitur usus esse Sulpicius (unless this be the orator mentioned above 140, 5). Pliny Ep. V 3, 5 (see above 26, 1) mentions also Ser. Sulpicium among the writers of erotic poems. See Ovid Trist. II 441 (above 158, 2).

4. Juridical writings of Sulpicius Rufus. Ser. Sulpicius iureconsultus, vir aetatis suae doctissimus, in libro de sacris detestandis secundo, Gell. VII (VI) 12, 1. Ser. Sulpicius in libro quem composuit de dotibus, ib. IV 3, 2. 4, 1 sq. Cf. Dig. XII 4, 8. XXIII 3, 79, 1. Ser. Sulp. in reprehensis Scaevolae capitibus, Gell. IV 1, 20. Commentary on the XII tables (above 76, 6). Servius duos libros ad Brutum perquam brevissimos Ad edictum subscriptos reliquit, Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 44. Cf. Ulp. ib. XIV 3, 5, 1: Servius libro primo ad Brutum. Perhaps also in Varro L. L. V 40: dividit in eo, Servius scribit Sulpicius, etc. A derivation of the word religio from relinquere is by Macrob. Sat. III 3, 8 ascribed to Ser. Sulpicius, by Gell. IV 9, 8 to the later Masurius Sabinus in commentariis quos de indigenis composuit. Plin. N. H. XXVIII 2 (5), 26: Servii Sulpicii, principis viri, commentatio est, quamobrem mensa linquenda non sit. It is several times quoted in the Digest, but direct extracts from his works do not occur. Ev. Otto, liber sing. de vita, studiis, scriptis, honoribus Ser. Sulpicii Rufi, in Otto Thesaur. V p. 1555—1630. S. W. Zimmern, History of Roman private law I 1 p. 290—292. R. Schneider, Quaestionum de Ser. Sulp.

Rufo icto rom. spec. I and II, Lips. 1834. A. F. Rudorff, History of Roman Law I p. 163. 235.

5. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 44: ab hoc plurimi profecerunt, fere tamen hi libros conscripserunt: Alfenus Varus, Caius (Catus according to Huschke's conjecture, see below 195, 2), A. Ofilius, T. Caesius, Aufidius Tucca, Aufidius Namusa, Flavius Priscus, G. Ateius, Pacuvius Labeo Labeonis Antisti pater, Cinna, Publicius Gellius (?). ex his decem libros octo conscripserunt, quorum omnes qui fuerunt libri digesti sunt ab Aufidio Namusa in CXXXX libros. Of these here enumerated no writings are known of T. Caesius and Flavius Priscus. Cinna belongs to those of less note, mentioned as a writer on law Dig. XXIII 2, 6. XXXV 1, 40, 1; so does Publicius, ib. XXXI 50, 2. XXXV 1, 51, 1. XXXVIII 17, 2, 8 (Africanus et Publicius), though he probably is of later date, whence in Pompon. l. l. we should probably follow Mommsen in reading Publius Gellius. G. Ateius seems to be the same as the one of whom it is stated Dig. XXIII 3, 79, 1: Ateius scribit Servium respondisse, and perhaps he may have been the father of the famous jurist C. Ateius Capito, who by Pompon. l. l. 47 is called a pupil of Ofilius. The father was trib. pl. 699, and praetor (perhaps 702); see Pauly's Encycl. I 2 p. 1954 sq. n. 2. In a collective expression Servii auditores (probably from the compilation of Aufidius Namusa) are quoted Dig. XXXIII 4, 6, 1. 7, 12 pr. 7, 12, 6. XXXIX 3, 1, 6.

6. Cic. Brut. 48, 179: cuius (i. e. T. Juventius, above 141, 3) auditor P. Orbius, meus fere aequalis, in dicendo non nimis exercitatus, in iure autem civili non inferior quam magister fuit. A. 691 he was praetor in Asia; Cic. p. Flacc. 31, 76: P. Orbius, homo et prudens et innocens.

7. A. Precianus iureconsultus is mentioned by Cic. ad fam. VII 8, 2 (a. 700). For Volcatius see above 141, 4.

8. Cic. ad Fam. V 20, 3 (a. 705): docuerunt me periti homines, in his cum omnium peritissimus tum mihi amicissimus C. Camillus, . . praedes Valerianos teneri. Cf. ib. XIV 5, 2 (a. 704): si auctio . . fiet, cures ut Pomponius (Atticus) aut . . Camillus nostrum negotium curet. 14, 2 (a. 705): cum Pomponio, cum Camillo . . consideretis. He is also mentioned in other passages as the legal adviser of Cicero and his family; see ad Att. V 8, 3. VI 1, 19. 5, 2. XI 16, 5. 23, 1. He is probably identical with Camillus who is jocularly styled a glutton (ad Fam. IX 20, 2, a. 708) and newsmonger (ad Att. XIII 33, 4, cf. ib. 6, 1, a. 709).

162. M. Tullius Cicero was born Jan. 3, 648 = 106 B. Chr. on his father's estate near Arpinum; he was the son of a Roman knight. He employed every means of studying rhetoric in all its branches, and pleaded his first cause under Sulla's dictatorship. To perfect himself still further, he spent two

years (675—677) in Greece and Asia, was then quaestor in Sicily (679), aed. cur. 682, praetor (urbanus) 688, and consul 691 = 63. The Catilinarian conspiracy, which broke out during Cicero's consulship and was suppressed by him, furnished the triumvirs in 695 with a pretext for removing the obnoxious consular by means of his enemy P. Clodius. At the end of April 696, Cicero left Italy and lived in exile at Thessalonica and Dyrrhachium. On Aug. 4, 697 he was permitted to return and arrived at Rome on Sept. 4. From July 31, 703 until July 30, 704 he was entrusted with the administration of the province of Cilicia, as proconsul. On his return to Rome, the contention between Caesar and the Senate, with Pompey at its head, had already broken out; after some hesitation, he joined Pompey at Dyrrhachium (June 705), where he also stayed during the battle of Pharsalus (Aug. 9, 706). From the end of Sept. 706 until Sept. 707, Cicero lived at Brundisium, awaiting the victor's return and the permission of going back to Rome. The years 708 and 709, which he was compelled to spend in political leisure, were all the more fertile in literary productions. The 15 March 710 recalled Cicero to political activity, but soon threw him into contention with M. Antony which ended in his being proscribed by the second triumvirate, and killed Dec. 7, 711 = 43.

1. See his biography by Plutarch. Of modern writers Con. Middleton, history of the life of Cicero, Dublin 1741. 4. 2 voll. Basle 1790. 4 voll. 8. W. Drumann, Hist. of Rome V p. 216—716. VI p. 1—380. H. M. Flemmer, Annales Ciceroniani, Copenhague 1848. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. VI 2 (1850) p. 2182—2206. C. A. F. Brückner, Cicero's life I: Cicero's political and private life, Göttingen 1852. W. H. D. Suringar, M. Tullii Cic. comm. rerum suarum s. de vita sua. Accesserunt Annales Ciceroniani, Lugd. Bat. 1854. 854 pp. W. Forsyth, Life of M. Tullius Cicero, London 1864. 2 vols. G. Boissier, Cicéron et ses amis, Paris 1865. 529 pp.

2. Oppenrieder, de Cic. proconsule Ciliciae, Augsburg 1853. 4. G. d'Hugues, de Cic. in Cilicia provincia proconsulatu, Strassburg 1859. Fr. Hoffmann, Cicero in Cilicia, Philologus XV p. 662—671.

163. Cicero was endowed by nature with great talents, many-sided, and versatile; at the same time kind, generous and assiduously bent upon high aims; a thoroughly respectable character in a period pervaded by egotism. But he was formed of pliable stuff, accessible to all outward impressions without interior self-

control to maintain his equanimity. His sensitiveness and imagination made him an amiable man and a great orator, in whom each string that was touched gave full and harmonious answer; his whole tone of mind qualified him especially to become the interpreter and transplanter of hellenic elegance and formal refinement; but these same qualities made his character undecided, wavering between intense excitement and utter prostration, crotchety, humorous, conceited, sensitive of sarcasm, afraid of danger and despairing in evil days. Others also might have their weak hours, but not many had them in such regular succession, and nobody had the misfortune he had of bequeathing to posterity such authentic documents of the fluctuations of his mind. Cicero was always under the sway of the moment and therefore little qualified to be a statesman, yet he had not sufficient self-knowledge to see it or resignation to act accordingly. Hence the attempts he made to play a part in politics served only to lay bare his utter weakness. Here also he was full of good intentions, but without calmness and wanting in acuteness to see the right path or the courage and perseverance required to follow it. Thus it happened that he was used and then pushed aside, attracted and repelled, deceived by the weakness of his friends and the strength of his adversaries, and at last was threatened equally by both extreme factions between which he had tried to steer his way.

1. Of the judgments of the ancients see especially Asinius Pollio in Sen. Suas. VI p. 36, 16 sqq. Bu: huius viri tot tantisque operibus mansuri in omne aevum praedicare de ingenio atque industria supervacuum est. . . utinam moderatius secundas res et fortius adversas ferre potuisset! namque utraeque cum venerant ei, mutari eas non posse rebatur. . . maiore simultates adpetebat animo quam gerebat. sed quando mortalium nulli virtus perfecta contigit, qua maior pars vitae atque ingenii stetit, ea iudicandum de homine est. Quintil. XII 1, 16: nec M. Tullio defuisse video in ulla parte civis optimi voluntatem.

2. In preceding centuries admiration for Cicero's style prevented an unprejudiced criticism of his character and political career. This was, however, more than sufficiently made up for by W. Drumann in his History of Rome, vol. VI, who criticised Cicero's character (p. 411—526 as man, p. 526—588 as politician) in all its sides, accurately, it is true, but in a carping spirit and suppressing all extenuating circumstances. Th. Mommsen (Hist. of Rome III² p. 597—600) tried, if possible, to surpass Drumann in exaggerated diction and unhistoric bitterness. A fair characteristic by C. Peter, Hist. of Rome II² p. 174—180. See also

W. Teuffel, on Cicero's character and works (Tübingen 1863. 4.) p. 1—5. F. D. Gerlach, M. Tullius Cicero, as orator, politician, and writer. Basle and Ludwigsburg 1864. 54 pp.

164. Cicero possessed, to a wonderful extent, the power of appropriating and assimilating to his own individuality foreign ideas which he knew how to dress up in an easy and pleasant style. Owing to this, he enriched Roman literature by introducing into it several new departments which had previously not been attempted; he became the creator of a standard prose which was so refined and so eminently suited to the genius of the Latin language that it was impossible to surpass it in subsequent centuries. But the ease and facility with which he threw off his productions tempted him to write fast and too much, and to cover with an easy style the want of serious studies and real learning. Cicero succumbed to this temptation at least during his leisure-time in 709 and 710. The real business of his life Cicero exhibits in his legal and political speeches, where indeed his talent shows to the greatest advantage. His speeches were carefully prepared beforehand and generally edited subsequent to their delivery. The knowledge and experience gained in this career were utilized by him in his rhetorical treatises. His theoretic compositions he also extended to other fields, first to political science, then to ethics, the philosophy of religion, and he even attempted the easier parts of theoretic philosophy. Besides all this, his extensive personal connexions and the habit of thinking pen in hand led to a very voluminous correspondence.

1. A. Deuerling, Cicero's importance in Roman literature, Augsburg 1866. 104 pp.

2. Chronological arrangement of Cicero's principal writings, independently of his youthful attempts in prose and poetry. a. 673: pro Quintio. — 674: pro Roscio Amerino. — 684: Verrinae. — 685: pro Caecina. — 688: de imperio Cn. Pompei. — 691: Consular speeches, de lege agraria, pro Rabirio, in Catilinam, pro Murena. — 692: pro Sulla, Archia. — 695: pro Flacco. — 697 sq.: Orations post reditum. — 698: pro Sestio, in Vatinium, pro Caelio, de provinciis cons., pro Balbo. — 699: in Pisonem, de oratore. — 700: de rep., pro Plancio, Rabirio Postumo. — 702: pro Milone, de legibus. — 708: Brutus, Paradoxa, Orator, pro Marcello, Ligario, partitiones oratoriae. — 709: pro Deiotaro, de finibus, Academica, Tusculanae. — 710: de deorum natura, Cato maior, de divinatione, de fato, Topica, de optimo genere or., Laelius, de officiis, Philipp. I—IV. — 711: Philipp. V—XIV.

3. On Cicero's style see F. Hand in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop. I 17 p. 241 sq. J. Bake, Schol. hypomnemata (Lugd. Bat. 1837) p. 1 sqq.

4. C. Halm, on the mss. of Cicero's works, München 1850. 24 pp. 4., by the same, Rh. Mus. IX p. 321—350. Jahn's Archiv XV p. 165 sqq. J. G. Baiter, Philologus XX p. 335—352. 507—509.

5. For the literature on Cicero see Schweiger, class. Bibliogr. II 1 p. 102 sqq. Orelli Onomast. Tull. VI 1 p. 193 sqq. 3 p. 344 sq. W. Wagner, class. Bibliogr. p. 367 sqq.

6. Complete editions of all the works: Ed. princ., Mediol. 1498. IV voll. fol. — Venet., Junt. 1534 sqq. IV voll. fol., by P. Victorius. — Venet. Ald., by P. Manutius 1540—1546. 9 voll. 8. — A Dion. Lambino emend. et aucta, Paris 1566. IV voll. fol. — Cum notis varr. cura J. G. Graevii, Amstelod. 1684 sqq. IX voll. 8, not finished. — Cum clavi Cic. ed. J. A. Ernesti, Lips. 1737 sqq. 6 voll. 8.; Halle 1757. 4 voll.; 1774 sqq. 5 voll.; 1820. 9 voll. — Cum delect. comm. (stud. Jos. Oliveti), Paris 1740. 9 voll. 4.; Genev. 1743 sqq. — E rec. Graevii (cura G. Garatonii), Neap. 1777 sqq. (not finished; only Vol. 1—11. 14—17. 23. 24 were published). — Cum notit. lit. et clavi, Bipont. 1780. 13 voll. 8. — Cum indd. et varr. lectt., Oxon. 1783. 10 voll. 4. with Oliveti del. comm., ibid. 1824. 4., Halle 1825 sqq. 3 voll. — Recogn. Ch. G. Schütz, Lips. 1814 sqq. 20 voll. — Rec. J. C. Orelli, Turici 1826 sqq. IV voll. gr. 8. Editio altera emendatior. vol. I (libri rhetorici). Curaverunt I. C. Orellius et I. G. Baiterus, Turici 1845. II. Orationes. Ad codd. ex magna parte primum aut iterum collatos emendaverunt I. G. Baiterus et C. Halmius. Pars prior. Tur. 1854. Pars posterior 1856. III. Epistolae. Curav. Orellius et Baiterus 1845. IV. (libri qui ad philosophiam et remp. spectant) ex libris mss. partim primum partim iterum excussis emend. Baiterus et Halmius 1861; to this an appendix 1862 Deperditorum fragmenta (without Baiter's and Halm's cooperation, except in the Timaeus). The fifth vol. of the first edition is entitled Cic. Scholiastae, C. Marius Victorinus, Rufinus, C. Julius Victor, Boëthius, Favonius Eulogius, Asconius Pedianus, Scholia Bobiensia, Scholiasta Gronovianus (on the latter of whom see Th. Mommsen, Rh. Mus. XVI p. 140—145), edd. J. C. Orelli et J. G. Baiter, 2 Partes, 1833. and Onomast. Tullianum (as vol. VI—VIII), continens Cic. vitam, hist. literariam, ind. geograph. et hist., ind. legum et formularum, indicem graecolat., fastos consulares, 1836—1838. 3 voll. — Ex rec. C. F. A. Nobbe, Lips. 1828. 1 vol. in 4. and X voll. in 8. iterum ed., Lips. 1849. 11 and 32 voll. — Cur. N. E. Lemaire, Paris 1827 sqq. 19 voll. 8. — C. L. F. Panckoucke (with a French translation), Paris 1835 sqq. 36 voll. — Recognovit R. Klotz, 11 voll. in V Partes (scripta rhet.; Orationes; Epp.; scripta philosophica, Indices), in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana (editio II emendatior, 1863 sqq.). — Edd. I. G. Baiter et C. L. Kayser (Lips., B. Tauchnitz, 1861 sqq.).

7. Lexicons on Cic.: Marii Nizolii Thesaur. Cic., Basil. 1559. Venet. 1570. fol. and often, e. g. Patav. 1734. fol. (Cur. J. Facciolati), Lond.

1820. 3 voll. 8. — Clavis Ciceroniana, ed. Ernesti (in his edition and frequently repeated, the last edition by A. H. Rein, Halae 1831). — Lex. Cic. by C. G. Schütz, Lips. 1817. 4 voll. Also Orelli's and Baiter's Onomast. Tull. and Pars V. of Klotz's edition (Lips. 1856).

165. As a speaker and orator, Cicero had a very happy natural talent; the extreme versatility of his mind, his lively imagination, his great sensitiveness, his uncommon formal talent, inexhaustible richness of expression, which was never at a loss for word or tone to suit any circumstance or mood, a felicitous memory, the talent of biting and amusing wit, a splendid voice and impressive figure, all contributed to render Cicero an excellent orator. But he himself did everything to attain the very highest perfection: not until he had spent a long time in laborious study and preparation, did he make his début as an orator, nor did he ever rest and think himself perfect, but was always working on, and never pleaded a cause without careful preparation; each success was to him only a step to another still higher achievement and by continual meditation and study he kept himself fully prepared for his task and the means of accomplishing it. Hence he succeeded, as is now universally admitted, in gaining a place beside Demosthenes, or at all events immediately after him, though he does not come up to the moral consciousness and consequent impressiveness of the Attic orator. But Cicero surpasses him in variety and splendour, where he is more akin to the Asiatic School than to the Attics. He commands such abundance of words as sometimes to become diffuse, though in other places he is verbose to cover the weakness of his arguments. His strongest part is his style; there he is clear, concise and apt, perspicuous, elegant and brilliant. He commands all moods, from playful jest to tragic pathos, but is most successful in the imitation of conviction and feeling, to which he gave increased impression by his fiery delivery; hence he pleaded especially in criminal causes. Sometimes, of course, his rhetoric degenerates to a mere study of effect, and the grandeur of his words serves only to hide the poverty of thought and the badness of the cause. It is true, he was not over-scrupulous as to the causes he pleaded, but this feature he shares with the solicitors and lawyers of all times. In their general effect, we are often dissatisfied with his speeches, since they are frequently deficient in acuteness and

distinctness; but we must allow him to be highly impressive in details.

1. Cicero's description of himself Brut. 93, 322, cfr. Quintil. X 1, 105—112. XII 1, 19—21. 10, 12—15.

2. Cic. orat. 30, 108: nemo orator tam multa ne in graeco quidem otio scripsit quam multa sunt nostra, eaque hanc ipsam habent quam probo varietatem.

3. Quintil. VI 3, 3: non solum extra iudicia sed in ipsis etiam orationibus habitus est (Cic.) nimius risus affectator. Cf. Macrob. Sat. II 1, 13. Drumann VI p. 599 sqq.

4. F. Hand in Ersch and Gruber I 17 p. 213—217. Drumann VI p. 588—644. Cadenbach, de Cicerone oratore, Essen 1847. 4. F. Blass, on Greek eloquence (1865) p. 125—129. A. Deuerling, on Cicero's importance p. 21—28.

5. A collection of Cicero's orations in which each speech formed a book by itself seems indicated by such citations as Charis. p. 368, 28 K.: Cicero causarum decimo tertio; Quintil. V 10, 98: Cicero pro Caecina . . et alia in eodem libro plurima.

6. Complete editions of the existing speeches of Cicero by R. Klotz (3 voll. Leipzig 1835. 1837. 1839), and esp. by Baiter, Halm and others in the second vol. of their re-issue of Orelli (Turic. 1854. 1856). See Halm in the Munich Gel. Anz. 1854, 19—21. [With English notes by G. Long, London 1855—62.]

7. Select speeches for school-use e. g. by Madvig (12; Copenh. 1830. 1841. 1848. 1858), Steinmetz (13; Mainz 1832), Orelli (15; Zürich 1836), E. v. Zurck (ed. sexta, Lugd. Bat. 1836), C. Halm (Leipzig and Berlin 1850—1866, 7 numbers, Weidmann collection) and others. There are also recent texts of the Halle selection (formerly edited by F. A. Eckstein); by G. Linker (or. Tullianarum decas, I. Wien 1857), Fr. Pauly (Prag 1860), C. Halm (18 orations; Berlin 1868).

166. The extant speeches of Cicero are in chronological order, as follows:

1) pro Quintio, delivered a. 673, an action in iudicio, in which Cicero's client was driven to the necessity of being the accuser, and demanded the decision in his favour of a previously formed sponsio praeiudicialis. The whole was only an incident in the main suit, concerning an accusation of debt against Quintius, founded on an agreement for partnership. Cicero does not appear to have won his cause. The speech is somewhat lengthy, but its arrangement is in strict accordance with scholastic rules.

1. In publication, Cicero himself seems to have omitted the third part which dealt with a point of less importance and little interest: see above 36, 7.

2. Drumann, Hist. of Rome III p. 82—84. V p. 232—234. F. L. Keller, Semestria ad M. Tull. Cic. I 1. (Zürich 1842) reviewed by Bachofen in Richter's Jahrb. 1842. p. 961—1007 and Th. Mommsen, Ztschr. f. AW. 1845. p. 1086—1099. Zeyss, Ztschr. f. AW. 1846. nr. 51 sq. S. J. E. Rau, disputat. iuridica ad Cic. or. p. Qu., Lugd. Bat. 1825. J. Frei, the law-suit of P. Quinctius and S. Naevius, an introduction to Cicero's speech for Q., Zurich 1852. 38 pp. S. Benfey, Contributions towards the legal explanation of Cicero's speech pro Quint., Philologus X p. 126—133. R. Klotz, Adnotatt. ad Cic. or. Quinct., Lips. 1862. 4.

3. A special edition with the speech pro Sex. Rosc. by J. Facciolati, Padua 1723. 1731.

2) pro Sex. Roscio Amerino, a. 674, a successful defence against a charge of parricide. The cause was difficult to deal with owing to the adversary's being a favourite of the dictator Sulla, and the mere fact of Cicero's taking up the defence, and his candid, though lenient, dealing with him was in his favour. This speech shares the qualities of the preceding, besides which it has many rhetorical decorations. The gap after ch. 45 seems not to have originated with Cicero himself.

1. Cic. Brut. 90, 312. 316. Orat. 30, 107. Quintil. XII 6, 4.

2. For the explanation of this speech see Schol. Gronov. in Orelli IV p. 421—437. Programs by S. N. J. Bloch, Copenhague 1814. 1816. Roeskild 1827 sq. 4. A. Nikl, abundantiam iuvenilem in Cic. or. p. R. A. apparentem notavit, Kempten 1836. 4. Drumann V p. 234—244.

3. Special editions by H. R. Matthäi (Schleswig 1799), W. Büchner (rec. emend. etc., Lips. 1835), J. C. Orelli (Zürich 1837. 4.), E. Osenbrüggen (with an introd. and notes, Brunswick 1844), G. W. Gossrau (Quedlinb. 1853), C. Halm (in the Weidmann collection I.), S. Karsten (Utrecht 1861), Fr. Richter (Leipzig, Teubner, 1864).

3) pro Q. Roscio Comoedo, according to the ordinary assumption delivered a. 678, while Drumann holds it to fall into the year 682. The speech turns upon a slave (Panurgus), whom the prosecutor, C. Fannius Chaerea, had sent to Roscius for the purpose of histrionic study, the agreement being that the profit anticipated from the art of the slave should be divided between the master and teacher. But a certain Flavius having killed Panurgus, had paid damages first to Roscius and then to Fannius, which are now to be divided between the two.

1. Unterholzer, in Savigny's Ztschr. I p. 248 sqq. F. A. C. Rovers, de Cic. or. p. R. C., Utrecht 1826. N. München, or. p. R. C. iuridice exposita, Colon. 1829. Puchta, Rh. Mus. V p. 316—328. G. E. Heimbach, observatt. iur. rom. (Lips. 1834) p. 18 sqq. Huschke in Richter's krit. Jahrb. 1840. p. 481 sqq. A. Hanedoes, diss. de Cic. p. R. C. oratione, Lugd. Bat. 1844. Drumann, V p. 346—348.

2. Or. p. R. C. ed., comm., adnott. illustr. C. A. Schmidt, Lips. 1839.

4) pro M. Tullio, delivered before reciperatores a. 682 or 683, a suit in Tullius' name against a neighbour of his, a veteran soldier of Sulla's, P. Fabius, who had destroyed Tullius' country house in the territory of Thurii.

1. Tac. dial. 20: quis (nunc) de exceptione et formula perpetietur illa immensa volumina quae pro M. Tullio aut A. Caecina legimus? Cf. Jul. Victor p. 240 Or. = 419 Halm. Schol. Bob. pr. Mil. p. 278 Or. — Drumann V p. 258, n. 64b, is in favour of a. 682.

2. Special editions by Mai, Peiron, Beier, see below 167, 2. Ph. E. Huschke in J. G. Huschke's Anal. lit. (Lips. 1826) p. 98 sqq. 372 sqq. E. J. Richter, Nürnberg 1834. 12. Keller, Semestr. I 3 p. 653 sqq. In the second issue of Orelli's complete edition p. 88—102.

3. C. Beier, iurisprud. in Cic. or. p. T. exponitur, in Jahn's Jahrb. I p. 214—220. Savigny, on Cic. or. p. T. and the actio vi bon. rapt., in der Ztschr. f. gesch. Rechtsw. V, nr. 3.

5) Divinatio in Caecilium, by which Cicero (a. 684) secured to himself the right of appearing against Verres in the prosecution for his praetorship in Sicily, in the place of the harmless Q. Caecilius Niger who had been put forward by Verres; and

6—11) in Verrem, consisting of two actions, the first of which was delivered on August 5, 684 as an introduction to the prosecution itself, when Cicero brought in the points of the accusation one by one, in giving merely the heads, and letting the witnesses and documents plead for themselves; but after sentence had been passed, he elaborated his rich materials in the five books of the actio secunda: de praetura urbana, de iurisdictione Siciliensi, de frumento, de signis, de suppliciis. This actio secunda was then edited, though it had never been really so delivered; yet the author speaks as if sentence had not yet been passed and these speeches might still influence the final decision.

1. Caecilius was ἀπελευθερικὸς ἄνθρωπος, ἔνοχος τῷ Ἰουδαΐζειν (Plut. Cic. 7); hence Cicero's witticism: quid Iudaeo cum verre? — J. W. Sluiter, spec. acad. in Cic. div. in Caec., Lugd. Bat. 1832.

2. Drumann V p. 263 sqq. 327. Ps.-Ascon. p. 97—213 Or. Schol. Gron. p. 382—405 Or. Francke, prolegg. in Cic. orr. Verr., Wittenb. 1823, and in Friedemann and Seebode Misc. crit. II p. 293 sqq. Madvig, Opusc. acad. I p. 323 sqq. P. C. Massé, disp. lit. iurid. de Cic. or. in V. de iurisd. Sic., Lugd. Bat. 1824. Brauneisen, Notes on the speeches against Verres, Hadersleben 1840. Kramarczik, Verres' robberies of works of art in explanation of Verr. IV., Heiligenstadt 1849. 4. König, de Cic. in Verr. artis operum aestimatore, Jever 1863. 4. H. Degenkolb, on the lex Hieronica etc., Berlin 1861. C. Halm, on the mss. of Cicero's speeches against Verres, espec. the Vatican palimpsest, in the Munich Gel. Anz. 1853, n. 29—33. W. G. Pluygers, Spec. emendat. in Cic. Verr. act. II. libr. 2 et 3. Lugd. Bat. 1855. 4.

3. Editions by C. G. Zumpt (Berlin 1831); G. Long (with a commentary, ed. II. London 1862). Separate editions of book II by Creuzer and Moser, Gott. 1847; IV by N. G. Eichhoff, Giessen 1825; V by Orelli, Leipz. 1831. The speech against Caecilius and IV and V by Verres explained by C. Halm (Weidmann collection) 1852 (with a map), 5 editions. The fourth and fifth book explained by Fr. Richter (Leipzig, Teubner) 1866.

12) pro M. Fonteio, a. 685, an actio repetundarum, not completely preserved.

1. The fragments of this speech were a. 1820 augmented by Niebuhr with fragments of the first part from a Vatican palimpsest (Rome 1820. 8.; also in Mai's Class. auct. II p. 363 sqq.), with new fragments of the commencement of the speech from a ms. of Nicolaus of Cues (Cusanus), by Jos. Klein (Berlin 1866), p. 57—78.

2. On the subject of the speech see Drumann V p. 329—335.

13) pro Caecina, a. 685, delivered before reciperatores, on a suit concerning an inheritance, at least the right of the letter being on Cicero's side.

1. Cic. orat. 29, 102. Cf. Tac. dial. 20. Quintil. V 10, 98. The solicitor of the defendant (L. Aebutius) was C. Piso.

2. H. C. Cras, diss. iurid. qua . . Cic. iustam pro Caec. causam dixisse ostenditur, Lugd. Bat. 1769. 4. Rumpf, Observ. in Cic. or. p. Caec., Giessen 1810. 4. Ph. E. Huschke, Analect. lit. p. 164 sqq. R. Klotz, adnot. crit. ad Cic. or. Caecin. partes I. II. Lips. 1866 sq. 51 pp. 4. Drumann V p. 335—344. F. L. Keller, Semestr. lib. II. (Zürich 1843) and Th. Mommsen, Ztschr. f. AW. 1845. n. 136 sqq. C. A. Jordan in the Prolegg. of his edition (Lips. 1847), and against him, Zeyss, Cic. lost the suit of Caecina, Ztschr. f. AW. 1848. nr. 109—111. A. H. G. Zimmermann, de A. Caecina (1852), p. 6—10.

14) De imperio Cn. Pompei, delivered a. 688 when Cicero was praetor, in support of the lex Manilia. The praise of Pompey is somewhat exaggerated, but the style is masterly.

1. Cic. de or. 29, 102. Fronto de bell. parth. p. 221 sq. Naber. Cf. Schol. Gronov. p. 437—442 Or.

2. Drumann V p. 356—459. A. Nikl, levitatem et fallaciam argumentationis in Cic. or. etc. ostend., Kempten 1842. 4. J. A. Reinhard, de aliquot locorum in Cic. or. p. l. M. fide historica, Freiburg i. Br. 1852. 33 pp. 8. Bauermeister, Cic.'s speech de imp. Cn. P. explained with reference to its rhetorical bearing, Luckau 1861. 31 pp. 4.

3. Editions by C. Beneke (Lips. 1834), Halm (Lips. 1849 and in the Weidmann Rosc. Am.), G. W. Gossrau (Quedlinburg 1854. 183 pp. 8., of which 140 pp. are introduction).

15) pro A. Cluentio Habito, the defence of a poisoner, a. 688.

1. Quintil. II 17, 21: Cicero se tenebras offudisse iudicibus in causa Cluentii gloriatus est. See ib. IV 5, 11. VI 5, 9. XI 1, 61—63. 74.

2. Drumann V p. 360 sqq. C. J. van Assen, disp. iurid. lit. de Cic. or. pr. etc., Franeker 1809. 8. — Critical edition by J. Classen, Bonn 1831.

16—18) The three speeches de lege agraria contra P. Servilium Rullum, the earliest of Cicero's consular speeches (691), impugning the immoderate proposals of the popular tribune Servilius to appoint a (democratic) committee of ten with the most extensive privileges concerning the purchase and distribution of land in Italy. His proposal (which was also directed against Pompey) is impugned by Cicero apparently on a democratic basis. The first speech was delivered in the Senate on Jan. 1, only the conclusion being extant, the second and (short) third are addressed to the people, while a fourth speech (likewise short) has not come down to us.

1. Cic. ad Att. II 1, 3. Quintil. II 16, 7.

2. Or. III de lege agr. in usum schol. rec. J. L. Ussing, Copenhagen 1850. Rec. et expl. A. W. Zumpt, Berlin 1861. See F. Richter in Jahn's Jahrbb. 87 p. 251—272.

3. B. Thorlacius, de lege Rulli agraria, in his Proluss. et opusc. acad., Copenh. 1806. p. 259—312. Drumann III p. 152 sqq. O. Zeyss, the political agitations of P. Servilius Rullus, an explanation of the agrarian speeches of Cicero, Reval 1846. 4. Mommsen, Hist. of Rome III² p. 169 sq.

4. H. C. Gebhardt, Obss crit. in Cic. orr. de l. agr. Hof 1851. 4. H. Ebeling, codicis Lagomarsini IX quae sit auctoritas in oratt. Tull. de lege agr. recensendis, cum mantissa de cod. Paris 7774, Brunswick 1863.

19) pro C. Rabirio perduellionis reo, a. 691.

1. On the subject-matter see Mommsen, Hist. of Rome III² p. 158 sq.

20—23) The four speeches in L. Catilinam, treating of the Catilinarian conspiracy, the first delivered in the Senate on Nov. 7 and charging Catiline with his latest steps; the second, of Nov. 8, informing the people of the events in the Senate and of Catiline's departure from Rome; the third, of the evening of Dec. 3, acquainting the people with the imprisonment of the Catilinarians left at Rome and the evidence of the letters seized on the Allobroges; the fourth pronounced in the Senate on Dec. 5, and recommending the immediate execution of the prisoners.

1. On the events themselves see espec. Drumann V p. 377—577. E. Hagen, Catiline, an historical investigation, Königsberg 1854. Mommsen, Hist. of Rome III² p. 162—182, and Hermes I p. 434.

2. F. A. Wolf was probably joking when maintaining the spuriousness of one of these speeches, though even later on he upheld it always ambiguously of altera ex mediis duabus. Owing to this hint, H. G. J. Cludius (in the program of Gumbinnen 1826. 4., reprinted in Seebode's Archiv II p. 47 sqq.) maintained the second to be spurious (though Wolf himself, if ever he was serious about it, thought rather of the third, see Körte, Wolf's Life I p. 332); R. A. Morstadt (program of Schaffhausen 1842. 1844) pronounced the first, and Zimmerman (Hamburg program 1829), E. A. Ahrens (Coburg 1832 and 1837. 4.) and others the fourth to be spurious, the latter of which assertions was contradicted by C. F. Schnitzer (Quaest. Cic., Aarau 1836. Heilbronn 1837. 4.), G. H. Kolster (Itzehoe 1839. 4.), E. P. Hinrichs (Hamburg 1839. 4.), Drumann (V p. 512—517. 520 sq.) and others. Orelli and Paldamus (Ztschr. f. AW. 1837. n. 65 sq. 1838 p. 112) suspected even the three last speeches. In Holland a young scholar, S. H. Rinkes (disp. de or. I in Cat. a Cicerone abiudicanda, Lugd. Bat. 1856. L and 66 pp. 8.) was encouraged to doubt the first by the example of Bake who subsequently came to his assistance (Over de method von onderzoek naar de echtheid of de onechtheid von Cic. I Cat., Amsterdam 1859. 44 pp. 4.). Others of his compatriots took the trouble of refuting him, see J. C. G. Boot, or. I in Cat. rec. et a Cic. male abiudicari demonstravit etc., Amsterdam 1857. XXV and 78 pp. 8. and in the Verslagen of the Dutch Academy V 1 (1860). E. J. Kiehl, Catilina, Deventer 1857. P. Epkema, Epist. crit. de or. I in Cat. frustra a Cic. abiudicata, Amsterdam 1857. 101 pp. 8. Karsten in the Verslagen of the Dutch Academy IV 2. Also C. Franke, I. Bakium or. I in Catil. a Cic. male abiudicasse, Sagan 1863. 4. On this question see the appropriate observations of Drumann V p. 470—474. Also Madvig Opusc. acad. II p. 338—351. Bäumlein in the Ztschr. f. AW. 1838. p. 66 sqq. E. Hagen, de Cic. Catilinariis ad . . Gottholdium. Königsberg 1851. 4. In defence of the historical accuracy of the first speech (against Drumann and Hagen, Catil. p. 213 sq.) see also Adam in the Heilbronn program 1855. 4.

Moderate criticism which does not presume spuriousness on the ground of any seeming or even actual defect will be obliged to leave these speeches to Cicero.

3. Editions by C. Morgenstern (Dorpat 1804), E. Anton (Leipzig 1827), C. Beneke (Leipzig 1828), J. Ph. Krebs (with pro Sulla, in us. schol., Giessen 1829), C. Halm (with p. Sulla and Arch. in the Weidmann collection).

24) pro L. Murena, in defence of the designated Consul Murena who was accused in accordance with the lex Tullia de ambitu (Nov. 591). It is throughout in a jocular vein, with witticisms on jurisprudence and Stoicism, representatives of which were then Cicero's opponents, Ser. Sulpicius Rufus and M. Cato. The speech does not, however, appear to have been delivered in quite the same form as it was published.

1. Quintil. XI 1, 69 sq. Plut. Cic. 35. Drumann V p. 477. n. 56 sq. J. Luzac, observ. apologett. pro Ictis rom. ad Cic. p. Mur. c. 11—13. Lugd. Bat. 1768. 4. Niebuhr, Rh. Mus. I 3 p. 223 sqq. F. Winiewski, quo tempore Murena ambitus sit reus factus, Münster 1853. 38 pp. 4. Matern, de ratione ea qua Cic. in or. p. Mur. habita cum Stoicos tum M. Catonem tractavit etc., Lissa 1854. 31 pp. 4. Boot, de emendanda et explicanda Cic. or. p. Mur., Mnemosyne V p. 347—364. C. Halm, on the mss. of Cicero's speech pro Murena, München 1861. 48 pp. 8. (forms part of the transactions of the Munich Academy.) G. Sorof, de Cic. p. M. or. commentatio critica. I. Potsdam 1861. 4. J. F. C. Campe, on the or. pro Mur., Jahn's Jahrbb. 93 p. 179—190.

2. Rec. et explicavit A. W. Zumpt, Berlin 1859. See the discussions of details by C. Halm and A. W. Zumpt, Berlin Ztschr. f. Gymn. XIV p. 881—907. XV p. 337—360. XVI p. 337—366. 833—840. Explained by G. Tischer (Berlin 1861), C. Halm (Berlin 1866), H. A. Koch (Leipzig, Teubner 1866).

25) pro P. Cornelio Sulla, of the year 692, a successful defence against an action of participation in the Catilinarian conspiracy.

1. Schol. Bob. p. 359—369 Or. Gell. XII 12, 2 sq. G. E. J. Everts, spec. acad. in Cic. or. p. Sylla, Noviomag. 1835. 8. M. Seyffert, Ep. crit. de Cic. p. Sulla et Sestio orr., Berlin 1848. 4. C. Campe, Contributions to the criticism of Cicero, part I (Greiffenberg 1860. 4) p. 21—25.

2. Editions by Frotscher (Lips. 1831. Commentary 1832) and C. Halm (Lips. 1845 and vol. III in the Weidmann collection).

26) pro Archia, delivered a. 692 in defence of the contested citizenship of Archias.

1. The speech abounds in declamation and its authenticity was, therefore, questioned by C. W. Schröter (rec., suas obss. adiec. M. C. B., Lips. 1818), who was contradicted by Fr. Platz (Seebode's Crit. Bibl. 1820. p. 774 sqq. 1821. p. 220 sqq. 783 sqq. 1822. p. 155 sqq. 335 sqq. 656 sqq. 1089 sqq.); but J. C. W. Büchner (Schwerin 1839. 1841. 4.) raised new doubts, which were opposed by J. Lattmann (Gött. 1847. 8.); but why should not Cicero have indulged in declamation? See also Tac. dial. 37: nec Ciceronem magnum oratorem P. Quintius defensus aut Licinius Archias faciunt: Catilina et Milo et Verres et Antonius hanc illi famam circumdederunt.

2. Editions by G. K. Schelle (text, transl. and comm., with p. Mil. and Lig., Leipz. 1797—1803. 3 parts), H. C. F. Hülsemann (c. carmin. Archiae, Lemgo 1800), C. C. G. Wiss (Leipz. 1814), M. C. B. (see n. 1), C. Levezow (Berlin 1823), R. Stürenburg (Lips. 1832. Leipz. 1839), C. Halm (Weidmann collection, vol. III).

3. For the explanation see Schol. Bob. p. 353—359 Or. P. Manutius, comm., Rome 1572. 4. G. van Walwyk, exerc. iur. philol. ad Cic. or. p. A., Lugd. Bat. 1776. 4. C. D. Ilgen, Opp. var. II 1 (Erfurt 1797). J. Th. Netscher, disp. iur. lit. de Cic. or. p. A., Lugd. Bat. 1808. K. H. Frotscher, Critical and exegetical notes, Schneeberg (Leipz.) 1821. Jacobs in Ersch and Gruber I 5 p. 137 sqq. Drumann IV p. 190—204. Schneither, Mnemosyne V p. 113—128.

27) pro L. Valerio Flacco, of a. 695, a successful defence against an actio repetundarum, raised by D. Laelius.

1. Even after the speech has been augmented from an Ambrosian and Vatican ms. (Mai Auctor. class. II p. 1—36), there is still left a gap between ch. 2 and 3. Macrob. II 1, 13: pro L. Flacco, quem repetundarum reum ioci opportunitate de manifestissumis criminibus exemit. is iocus in oratione non exstat: mihi ex libro Fusii Vivaculi notus est.

2. C. A. Poortmann, diss. lit. iurid. de Cic. or. p. Fl., Lugd. Bat. 1835. Drumann V p. 619—631.

28—31) Four speeches post reditum, viz. oratio cum Senatui gratias egit, (29) or. cum Populo gratias egit, (30) de domo sua ad pontifices, to prove the invalidity of the consecration of the site of his house by Clodius and the possibility of its restitution, all three of September 697; (31) de haruspicum responsis, of a. 698 and caused by the declaration of the haruspices, that sacred institutions were being violated, a declaration explained by Clodius of Cicero's house (as a consecrated site), but which Cicero applies to Clodius himself.

1. The first speech is an expression of thanks for the efforts of the Senate in favour of Cicero's return (ad Att. IV 1, 5). For the

third speech cf. ad Att. IV 2, 2. Quintil. X 1, 23; for the fourth Ascon. p. 69 Or. and Quintil. V 11, 42.

2. The second speech, ad populum, cannot be proved authentic by external arguments, though there is no reason to suspect it on internal grounds. The other three are undoubtedly genuine, though their authenticity has often been questioned. J. Markland (Remarks on the epistles of Cic. to Brutus etc. with a dissertation upon four orations ascribed to Cic., London 1745, cf. Wolf's edition p. XLVII sqq.) was in his doubts greatly supported by F. A. Wolf (Cic. quae vulgo feruntur oratt. IV etc., Berli. 1801), whose views were adopted by Schütz, Orelli and others. On the other hand, arguments were drawn from the style and subject and also from the authority of the mss. in favour of the authenticity of these speeches, against Markland by Ross (by deductio ad absurdum, in his diss. in which the defence of Sulla etc., London 1746) and Gesner (Cic. restitutus, in the comm. soc. Gott. III p. 223—284), against Wolf by J. A. Savels, disp. de vindicandis Cic. V oratt. (also pro Marcello), Cologne 1828. 4. and in his ed. of the or. p. r. in Sen. (Cologne 1830) and de Cic. or. pro domo ad Pontifices (Essen 1833. 4.), Th. Lucas, Quaest. Tull. spec. (Hirschberg 1837. 4.), Drumann II p. 300 sq. n. 69. p. 311 sqq., G. Lahmeyer, orat. de harusp. resp. habitae originem Tullianam etc., Göttingen 1849. Meerdervort, ann. ad or. q. Cic. fertur de har. resp., Lugd. Bat. 1850. A. Dietzsch, on Halm's edition of the orations of Cicero in its bearing on the authenticity of the doubtful speeches, Rhein. Mus. XII p. 529 sqq.

3. H. Wagner, Cic. or. post red. in senatu rec., scripturae var. adiecit, prolegomenis instruxit, annotationibus . . explanavit, defendit, Lips. s. a. (1857), 74 pp. 8.

32) pro P. Sestio, of March 698, a successful defence against a suit de vi, in which Cicero avails himself of all the means of eloquence. The orator speaks, however, at greater length of himself and the aristocratic party than of the accusation and the accused.

1. Ad Q. fr. II 4, 1: Sestius noster absolutus est a. d. V. Id. Mart. et . . omnibus sententiis absolutus est. . . scito nos in eo iudicio consecutos esse ut omnium gratissimi videremur. nam defendendo et moroso homini cumulatissime satis fecimus et . . Vatinium . . concidimus. Schol. Bob. p. 291—313 Or. J. D. van Dam, spec. lit. in Cic. or. p. S., Lugd. Bat. 1824. Madvig Opusc. acad. p. 411—524. 524 sqq. T. Baden in Jahn's Archiv III p. 197 sqq. Drumann V p. 664 sqq. C. F. Hermann, Vindiciae lect. Bern. in Cic. or. p. Sestio, Göttingen 1852. 4. Bacher in the Berl. Ztschr. f. Gymn. XVI p. 840—864. 913—929. H. Probst in Jahn's Jahrbb. 97, p. 351—354. H. Wrampelmeyer, librorum mss. qui Cic. orr. p. Sest. et pro Cael. continent ratio qualis sit, Götti. 1868. 4.

2. Editions by O. M. Müller (Köslin 1827. curae sec. ib. 1831), J. C. W. Lotzbeck (Baireuth 1829, with p. leg. Man.), Orelli (with pro

Cael. Zurich 1832. 8., in the Ind. lect. Zurich 1834. 4., the third time, Heidelberg 1835. 4.), C. Halm (Lips. 1845 and 1853 sqq. in the Weidmann collection, vol. IV), H. A. Koch (Leipzig, Teubner, 1863).

33) In P. Vatinium, connected with the suit against Sestius, in which Vatinius had been a witness for the prosecution. This speech was also successful.

1. Cic. ad Qu. fr. II 4, 1 (see nr. 32, 1). Schol. Bob. p. 315—325 Or. Drumann V p. 682 sqq.

2. Edition by Halm, Lips. 1846.

34) pro M. Caelio, of a. 698, full of *esprit* and cutting witticisms, especially against the real prosecutrix, the ill-famed Clodia; a speech of much importance for our knowledge of Roman morals.

1. J. Klerk, de Cic. or. p. C., Lugd. Bat. 1825. Madvig Opusc. acad. p. 375 sqq. Schwabe, Quaest. Catull. p. 63 sq. 66 sq. Vollenhoven, Emend., Lugd. Bat. 1839. H. Wrampelmeyer (see nr. 32, n. 1). W. Oetling, librorum mss. qui Cic. p. C. continent . . condicio . . eiusdem Caelianae virtutes et vitia . . investigantur et . . illustrantur, Götti. 1868. 4.

2. Edition by Orelli (Zurich 1832, with pro Sest.).

35) De provinciis consularibus, delivered about the end of May 698 in order to obtain the prolongation of the governorship of Gaul for Caesar.

1. Drumann V p. 706 sqq. Mommsen R. H. III² p. 305, note. Madvig Opusc. II p. 1 sqq.

2. Ed. Orelli, Zurich 1833. 4. Explained by G. Tischer, Berlin 1861 (Weidmann).

36) pro L. Balbo, of a. 698, the defence of an intimate friend of Caesar's (and Pompey's) against the charge of arrogation of the rights of citizenship.

1. Rumpf, Obss. in Cic. p. Balbo, Giessen 1814. 4. P. J. Elout, de Cic. or. p. B., Lugd. Bat. 1828. 121 pp. 4. Madvig Opusc. l. l. W. Büchner, annott. critt. ad or. etc. Schwerin 1866. 4.

37) In L. Pisonem, of a. 699, delivered in the Senate, a speech of monstrous vehemence.

1. The commencement has been lost. Eleven fragments of it were for the first time published by J. Klein (Berlin 1866) from the ms. of Nicolaus Cus. (p. 49 sq.). See Gött. Gel. Anz. 1866 p. 1582—1586. C. Halm in Jahn's Jahrbb. 93 p. 623—628.

2. Ascon. p. 1—17 Or. H. Lagomarsini, in Friedemann and Seebode's Misc. crit. I p. 329 sqq. Drumann VI p. 4 sqq.

38) pro Cn. Plancio, of a. 700, against a charge of bribery.

1. Schol. Bob. p. 253—273 Or. G. de Man, de Cic. or. p. Pl., Utrecht 1809. 4. Drumann VI p. 45 sqq. H. Keil, obss. critt. in — Erlangen 1864. 4. C. Campe, on the speech pro Pl., in Jahn's Jahrbb. 95, p. 265—273.

2. Editions by G. Garatoni (Bologna 1815. 4.), Orelli (Lips. 1825), E. Wunder (Lips. 1830. 4.), E. Köpke (Leipz. 1856).

39) pro C. Rabirio Postumo, the (probably unsuccessful) defence of a partisan of Caesar's against a well-founded charge of extortions, a. 700.

1. Quintil. III 6, 11. IV 2, 10.

2. Drumann VI p. 71 sqq. C. Halm, on Cicero's speech pro C. R. P., a critical essay, Munich 1855. 52 pp. 4. (From the transactions of the Munich Academy VII 3). B. ten Brink, loci quidam corruptiores in Cic. or. etc., Philologus XI p. 92—100.

40) pro T. Milone on the death of Clodius, which is represented as an act of self-defence on the part of Milo, a. 702. It is not, however, the speech actually delivered (which was not successful), but a subsequent revision of it, a real masterpiece of oratorical art.

1. Ascon. p. 31—55 Or. (ed. ill. Frotscher, Freiberg. 1845. 4.). Quintil. VI 5, 10. X 5, 20. Schol. Bob. p. 275—290. Schol. Gron. p. 443 sq.

2. C. A. Schwarz, an Cic. ob Mil. defensum sit reprehendendus, Görlitz 1789. 4. F. W. Hagen, exercit. acad. in Cic. or. p. M., Erlang. 1792. J. L. Puttmann, de moderatione inculpatae tutelae, ad Cic. or. Mil. (Opusc. iur. crim. p. 111 sqq.). A. F. G. Curth, de artificiosa forma or. p. M., Berlin 1833. Spengel, Ztschr. f. AW. 1844. p. 432 sqq. C. W. Elberling, narratio de T. Annio Milone, Copenh. 1840.

3. Bierregaard, de supplem. Peyron. lacunae or. Mil. XII. Copenh. 1830. C. Wex, on Cic. p. M., Jahn's Jahrbb. 83 p. 207—213. L. Lange, Obss. ad Cic. or. Mil., I. Giessen 1864. 4. II. ib. 1865.

4. Editions by Schelle (see n. 26), G. Garatoni (Bologna 1817), Orelli (Lips. 1826), W. Freund (Breslau 1838. 4.), E. Osenbrüggen (Hamb. 1841), C. Halm (Weidmann vol., vol. V), J. Wagener (Paris 1860), Fr. Richter (Leipzig, Teubner, 1864).

41) pro M. Marcello, a. 708, addressed to Caesar in the Senate for the purpose of obtaining the return of an old adversary of his.

This speech, though proved to be genuine by quotations and testimonies, has been doubted by the exaggerated sagacity of some critics, and especially F. A. Wolf (following the way first pointed out by the Spanish Jesuit Juan Andrez) left nothing unattempted to prove it to be bad and therefore not Ciceronian; see his preface to his edition of the speech (Berlin 1802. 8.). His views were accepted and supported by Spalding (de or. Marcell., in Wolf's and Buttmann's Mus. antiq. stud. I 1808), Schütz, Orelli and others; and impugned with arguments of unequal value by Ol. Worm (*νοθείας* suspic. liberare conatus est, Copenh. 1803), F. Kalau (ad Wolfianas or. p. M. castigatt., Frankf. 1804. 4), B. Weiske (comment in or. . . cum append., Lips. 1805), Barbier-Vemars (in his Mercure latin, Paris 1813. V. and in Seebode's Archiv 1824. p. 475. sqq.), Hug (Lucubr. de or. Cic. p. Marc., Freiburg 1817. 4.), Savels (see above 28 sqq.), F. Passow (Miscellaneous Writings, Leips. 1843. p. 258 sqq.), Drumann VI p. 266 sqq.; a kind of mediation (by assuming the existence of interpolations in the speech etc.) was attempted by A. L. G. Jacob (de or. quae inscrib. p. Marc. Ciceroni vel abiudicanda vel adiud., Berl. and Halle 1813), who was followed by Hand and others. See also Schol. Ambr. p. 370 sq. Schol. Gronov. p. 418 sqq. Or. Drumann VI p. 262 sqq.

2. A separate edition by Seebode (Brunsw. 1815). G. Keller, nonnulla de Cic. or. p. Marc. (Ratibor 1845. 4.) and with a German translation and notes (Ratibor 1860. 4.).

42) pro Q. Ligario, a public intercession with Caesar in favour of an exiled partisan of Pompey's.

1. B. Weiske (in his edition of pro Marc.) needlessly suspects the authenticity of this speech. For the explanation see Schol. Ambros. p. 371 sq. Schol. Gron. p. 414 sqq. Or. P. H. A. Zillesen, de or. p. L., Lugd. B. 1826.

2. Editions by Schelle, Soldan (Hanau 1839), C. Halm (Weidmann collection V).

43) pro rege Deiotaro, in defence of the king of Galatia of that name against the charge of attempting to murder Caesar, delivered at Caesar's residence, October 709.

1. Schol. Ambr. p. 372. Schol. Gron. p. 421 sqq. Or. Muret's nott. in or. p. D., in his Opusc. III p. 858 sqq. C. J. G. Mesche, de Cic. in scribenda or. p. D. consilio etc., Lübeck 1815. 4. and in Friedmann and Seebode's Misc. crit. I p. 218 sqq.

2. Editions by Frotscher (Lips. 1835), Soldan (Hanau 1836), C. Halm (Weidmann collection V).

44—57) The fourteen Philippicae (Antonianae), of the years 710 and 711. In the first (2 Sept. 710) the speaker endeavours to justify his long absence from the stage of political life and complains of a late attack on the part of his 'friend'

M. Antony. When Antony had been roused by this, on 19 Sept., to make a speech in the Senate in which he attacked the whole political career of Cicero (who was, however, absent), the orator wrote a reply in the form of an answer returned on the spot, but which was not published until after Antony's departure from Rome — the second Philippica. In the third (Dec. 20), he recommends to the Senate to award special praise to D. Brutus and Octavianus for resisting the Consul, M. Antony, and this having been obtained, Cicero the same evening announced the resolution to the people, in the fourth speech. The fifth speech (1 Jan. 711) has the purpose to recommend the awarding of special honours to those adversaries of M. Antony and to declare him an enemy of the state. The first part of this having been passed on 4 Jan., but an attempt at mediation being contemplated in the place of the second half, Cicero announced this to the people the very same day, in the sixth speech. The seventh is intended again to urge the immediate declaration of war against M. Antony, and in the eighth (beg. of February) he blames the adoption of an unsatisfactory measure after that attempt had failed, and puts forth positive proposals of his own. In the ninth he again attacks M. Antony and recommends special distinctions and honours to be awarded to Ser. Sulpicius. In the tenth speech the subsequent confirmation of the measures taken by M. Brutus in Macedonia and Greece is recommended. The eleventh (middle of March 711) is an unsuccessful pleading in favour of the punishment of Dolabella (who had executed C. Trebonius, one of the assassins of Caesar) being committed to C. Cassius, himself one of the assassins. In the twelfth, Cicero attempts to prevent the second embassy to M. Antony (which had been decided on) and to free himself from all share in it. In the thirteenth (20 March 711) he defends his warlike policy against the peaceful advice of M. Lepidus and Munatius Plancus. In the fourteenth and last (22 April 711) he recommends the celebration of a great thanksgiving on account of the victory gained over M. Antony near Forum Gallorum, and honours to the victorious generals.

1. The most famous is the second Philippica, see Juvenal X 125 sq.

2. Editions of the Philippicae by G. G. Wernsdorf (Lips. 1821 sq. 2 voll., an amended text ib. 1825), Orelli (Zurich 1827); the second

separately by Wernsdorff (with a Germ. transl., Leipzig 1815), H. A. G. Winckler (Cassel 1829), Frotscher (Lips. 1833 and 1835). The first and second by C. Halm in the Weidmann coll., [the second with notes from Halm by J. E. B. Mayor.]

3. J. Mittermayr, Contributions to the explanation of the first Philippica (Aschaffenb. 1841. 4.), to the second (ib. 1843. 45. 4.). C. Campe, Philol. X 627 sqq. and Jahn's Jahrb. 91 p. 163—174. F. G. Jentzen, on Cic.'s fourth Philippica etc., Lübeck 1820. Against A. Krause's groundless doubts of the authenticity of the fourth speech (Cic. quae fertur Phil. IV expl. et Ciceroni derogavit, Berlin 1839, and on Cic.'s fourth Phil., Neüstettin 1847. 4. = Jahn's Jahrb., Suppl. XIII p. 297—313), see Schuster, Vindiciae Cic. or. Phil. quartae, Lüneb. 1851 sq. 4. Schirlitz, Cic. Phil. nona, Wetzlar 1844. 4. V. F. Deycks, de Cic. Phil. orr. cod. Vaticano, Münster 1844.

167. Besides these 57 speeches we possess fragments of about 20 more, and we know of 33 others delivered by Cicero. In addition to these there are a number of laudations which were published, but never pronounced, viz. of Caesar (a. 698), Cato the younger (a. 708) and his sister Porcia (a. 709).

1. Of the fragments by far the most important are those of the two Cornelianae (pro C. Cornelio, de maiestate (of a. 688, see Ascon. p. 56—81 Or. and Quintil. VIII 3, 3 sq. cf. VI 5, 10. X 5, 13), of the oratio in toga candida (a. 690) and of the speech pro M. Aemilio Scauro, a. 700, see Drumann VI p. 36—45. Ascon. p. 18—30. Schol. Bob. p. 373—376 Or.

2. Editions of the fragments of orations: Sex orationum partes ineditae, ed. A. Mai. Ed. alt., Mail. 1817. 8.; Auctor. class. II p. 277—325. Oratt. p. Fonteio et C. Rabir. fragmenta ed. Niebuhr, Rom 1820. Oratt. p. Scaur., Tull. et in Clod. fragmenta inedita ed. A. Peyron, Stuttg. 1824. 4. Oratt. p. Tull., in Clod., p. Scauro, p. Flacco fragmenta ined. coll. C. Beier, Lips. 1825 with Indd. (edited by G. Hertel), Lips. 1831. Oratt. p. Tull., in Clod., p. Scauro, p. Flacco ed. et expl. E. L. d'Engelbronner, Rotterdam 1830. Complete collections of all the fragments are found in the editions of Nobbe (p. 119 sqq.), Klotz (IV 3 p. 201—249) and Orelli IV 2 p. 439—459 = IV p. 929 -966. 1011—1055 sqq. of the second edition (Turici 1861), to which comp. C. Halm, Contributions to the emendation and completion of the fragments of Cicero (Leipzig 1862), esp. p. 15—31.

3. On the 33 speeches see Orelli IV 2 p. 460 sq. = p. 966 sq. of the second edition. Westermann, History of Roman eloquence p. 341 sq.

4. Sketches of speeches by Cicero were from his papers published by his freedman Tiro. Quintil. X 7, 30: quod fecisse M. Tullium commentariis ipsius apparet. ib. 31: Ciceronis ad praesens modo tempus aptatos (commentarios) libertus Tiro contraxit. Cf. ib. IV 1, 69: Cicero

pro Scauro ambitus reo, quae causa est in commentariis (nam bis eundem defendit), prosopopoeia . . utitur. Hieronym. apol. ad Rufin. II p. 469 Vall. (in commentariis causarum, pro Gabinio).

5. For Cicero's laudatio Caesaris see ad Att. IV 5; for his laudatio Porciae ib. XIII 37, 3. 48, 2.

6. Plut. Caes. 54: *ἔγραψε Κικέρων ἐγκώμιον Κάτωνος, ὄνομα τῷ λόγῳ θέμενος Κάτωνα.* Fr. Schneider, de Ciceronis Catone minore, Ztschr. f. AW. 1837. n. 150 sq. H. Wartmann, Cato of Utica (Zürich 1858) p. 145—153. C. Göttling, de Cic. laudatione Catonis et de Caesaris Anticatonibus, Jena 1865. 4. With an Additamentum, 1865. 4. Orelli IV p. 987 sq. The contents of this laudation of Cato gave some offence to Caesar (ad Att. XII 40, 1. XIII 27, 1), though he fully admitted its excellence in point of form (ib. XIII 46, 2); he therefore caused Hirtius to write a reply and even wrote an Anticato himself. M. Brutus, on the other hand, thought Cicero's treatise somewhat too cool and narrow-minded, Cicero (from prudential motives) having confined himself to Cato's private character; hence he too (beg. of 709) wrote a Cato.

7. The spurious speech pridie quam in exilium iret is found e. g. in Orelli's second edition II p. 1412 sqq. On the supposititious speeches of Sallust and Cicero against each other, see below 193.

168. In the theory of rhetoric, Cicero was a disciple of the Greeks and in his early years even translated a Greek manual. In his mature age he wrote original works on rhetoric, not in order to develop the theory of it, but to show his own position in the history of Roman eloquence and defend his style against his adversaries. He knew how to set forth the principal doctrines of rhetoric in popular form. In his opposition to mere doctrines and the hollow schematism of scholastic rhetoric, Cicero even drifted into the extreme of mere empiricism and frequently missed distinctness of definition.

1. All the rhetorical writings of Cicero were edited by C. G. Schütz (Lips. 1804. 1808, 3 voll.) and form the first volume of Orelli's edition; the smaller edited by J. F. Wetzel (Liegnitz 1807. 1823) and Orelli (Zurich 1830).

2. C. W. Piderit, on the value of the rhetorical writings of Cicero, in Jahn's Jahrb. 82 p. 503—516. L. Spengel, Rhen. Mus. XVIII p. 495—498. H. Jentsch, Aristotelis ex arte rhetorica quid habeat Cicero, Berlin 1866. 8.

169. The extant rhetorical works of Cicero in chronological order are as follows.

1) Rhetorica, an early and unripe work, especially from Hermagoras, as it seems. The two books, the only ones completed, treat of rhetorical subject-matter, de inventione, and are therefore generally called so.

1. Cic. de or. I 2, 5: quoniam quae pueris aut adolescentulis nobis ex commentariolis nostris inchoata ac rudia exciderunt vix hac aetate digna et hoc usu, quem ex causis quas diximus tot tantisque consecuti sumus. Cf. 6, 23. Quintil. II 14, 4. 15, 6 (in rhetoricis, quos sine dubio ipse non probat). III 1, 20 (rhetoricos suos). 3, 6 (Cic. in Rhetoricis). 5, 14 sq. (ex Cic. rhetorico I. . . ipse hos libros improbat). 6, 50 (Cicero in libris rhetoricis = de inv. I 8) and 58 (in primo Ciceronis rhetorico). 59 sq. (Cic. his pulcherrimos illos de oratore libros substituit), 64. Hieronym. adv. Rufin. I p. 137.

2. Cic. de inv. II 2, 4: quoniam nobis quoque voluntatis accidit ut artem dicendi perscriberemus, non unum aliquod proposuimus exemplum, cuius omnes partes . . exprimendae nobis necessario viderentur, sed omnibus unum in locum coactis scriptoribus quod quisque commodissime praecipere videbatur excerpsimus etc. Hermagoras is mentioned I 6, 8. 9, 12. 11, 16. 51, 97. Quintil. III 6, 59: sunt velut regestae in hos commentarios quos adolescens deduxerat scholae, et si qua est in his culpa, tradentis est. Cf. ib. 11, 10. 18 (in Rhetoricis Hermagoran est secutus).

3. "The author had the Rhetorica ad Herennium (see above 149) before him and frequently availed himself of it; he always endeavours to improve upon it, but as a rule deteriorates it". — "The whole genus demonstrativum is treated in one single chapter, the last, thus proving that the youthful author had already given up the idea of executing the four remaining parts". L. Spengel, Rhen. Mus. XVIII p. 495.

4. There is a commentary on this work by Victorinus; see Halm's Rhett. latt. minores p. 153—304. Cf. C. L. Kayser, Philologus VI p. 706—718. Excerpta ex Grillii commento in Cic. de inv. in Halm l. l. 596—606.

5. Separate edition, with the notes of Lambinus, Gronovius and others, by P. Burmann, Lugd. Bat. 1761, reprinted by F. Lindemann, Leipzig 1828, school-edition 1829.

6. A. Linsmayer, Variae lectiones ad Cic. libr. I de inventione ex IV codd. exscriptae, congessit et brevi annot. instr., München 1853 (VIII and 27 pp. 8.) = C. Halm, Analecta Tulliana, fasc. II. F. A. Eckstein, Varietas lectionis codicis Leidensis ad Cic. de inv. libros II. Halle 1854. 4.

2) De oratore libri tres, written a. 699, in the form of a dialogue between the two greatest orators of the preceding period, L. Crassus and M. Antonius, and several others, supposed to take place a. 663. By this form the treatment has gained

in facility, comprehensiveness and vivacity, and Cicero avoids dry systematic explanation and the necessity of himself deciding in favour of one style, though it is evident that his characters pronounce only his own views. It is true, the dramatic art of a Platonic dialogue is not equalled, but still the work belongs to the most finished productions of Cicero on account of its varied contents and its excellent style. The first book treats of the studies necessary to an orator, the second of the treatment of the subject-matter, and the third of the form and delivery of a speech.

1. Cic. ad Att. XIII 19, 4. Fam. I 9, 23 cf. VII 32, 2. Above 139, 3.

2. J. A. Ernesti, de praestantia librr. Cic. de or., Lips. 1736. 4. J. F. Schaarschmidt, de proposito etc., Schneeb. 1804. H. A. Schott, comm. qua III de or. libri examinantur, Lips. 1806. 4. C. F. Matthiä, Prolegg., Frankf. 1812. 4. Scholten, animadvv. in Cic. de or. libros, Utrecht (1828) 72 pp. 8. E. L. Trompheller, Vers. einer Charakteristik der etc., Coburg 1830. 4. Busch, Obss. ad Cic. de or., Rostock 1830. 4. Rhode, de anacoluthis in Cic. de or., Breslau 1833. C. G. König, Opuscc. latt. (Meissen 1834) p. 359 sqq. Paul, de Cic. de or., Thorn 1840. 4. Ellendt's introd. to his edition II p. VII sqq. C. Kuniss, quaedam de Cic. de or., Dresden 1842. Brückner, quid Cic. in libris de or. ex Isocrate et Aristotele mutuatus sit, Schweidnitz 1849. 4.

3. Editions e. g. by Z. Pearce (Cambridge 1716, the last time Lond. 1795), G. C. Harless (Lips. 1816), O. M. Müller (Züllichau 1819. 1838), R. J. F. Henrichsen (Copenhagen 1830), C. G. Kuniss (Leipz. 1837), and above all by Fr. Ellendt (Königsb. 1840. 2 voll.). See C. Fränkel, Addenda and Corrigenda in Fr. Ellendt's Commentary on Cic. de or., 5 parts, Dorpat 1855—1860. C. W. Piderit on the criticism and explanation of Cic. de or., Hanau 1857. 1858. 4. Bake (on b. III) in Mnemosyne VII p. 97—123. G. Sorof, Philologus XXI p. 654—674 and Vindiciae Tullianae, Berlin 1866. 4. Explained by C. W. Piderit, Leipz. 1859. 1862. 1868. Rec. Io. Bake, Amsterdam 1863.

3) Brutus de claris oratoribus, written in the beginning of 708, a pragmatic history of Roman eloquence, highly valuable on account of the abundance of the historical materials contained in it, as well as many pertinent and vivid sketches of character, and information in regard to Cicero's studies. The form of a dialogue is handled with greater ability than in the philosophical works; though there are small imperfections of style here and there.

1. See 93, 319. Or. 7, 23. Quintil. X 1, 38. Above 140, 7. 158, 10.

2. All extant mss. of the Brutus and of the Orator are of the second half of the 15th century and descended from the one discovered

at Lodi about 1420, but subsequently lost and surviving now only in the copies taken from it. There is something wanting at the conclusion.

3. Edition by Wetzel (Nürnberg 1776, Halle 1793), Orelli (with the other smaller rhetorical writings, Zurich 1830), H. Meyer and G. Bernhardy (Halle 1838) Kuniss (Leipz. 1838), C. Peter (Leipz. 1839), Fr. Ellendt (Königsb. 1825 and especially 1844), O. Jahn (Leipz. 1849, Berlin 1856, 1865), C. Beck (third edition, Cambridge in Massachussets 1853. 195 pp. 8.), C. W. Piderit (Leipz. 1862).

4. E. L. Trompheller, remarks on Cicero's Brutus, Coburg 1832. 4. E. Marggraff, Obss. criticae in O. Jahnii editionem Bruti Cic., Berlin 1855. 4. G. Schwister, Quaestiones aetiologicae in Cic. Brutum, Bonn 1857. Bake, Curae secundae in Cic. Br., Mnemosyne VI p. 421—438. Piderit, on the criticism and explanation of Cicero's Brutus, Hanau 1860. 1862. 4. (Campe,) Contributions to Ciceronian criticism, part I (Greiffenberg 1860. 4.) p. 1—21. J. Mähly, Rhen. Mus. XX p. 637—640. G. Hänel, ad Cic. Brut. 27, 106. Lips. 1867. 4.

4) Orator ad M. Brutum, Cicero's 'last word' on rhetoric giving his ideal of an orator, though of greater value for various details and isolated remarks than for completeness and systematic arrangement; it was also written a. 708.

1. Cic. ad Fam. VI 18, 4. XV 20, 1. de divin. II 1, 4. ad Att. XIV 20, 8 and Fam. XII 17, 2 called de optimo genere dicendi from its contents.

2. Editions by H. Meyer (Lips. 1827), Orelli (Zürich 1830), F. Göller (Lips. 1838), Peter and Weller (Leipz. 1838), O. Jahn (Leipz. 1851. Berlin 1859), Piderit (Leipzig, Teubner, 1865).

3. G. Weller, Symb. critt. ad Cic. or., Meiningen 1837. 4. Paul, de or., Thorn 1844. 4. Bake, de emendando Cic. or., Lugd. B. 1856. 82 pp. 4. Piderit, Eos I p. 401—409. II p. 168—181; Jahn's Jahrbb. 91 p. 372—374. 765—772. Vollbehr, ad Cic. or. symbb. criticae, Glückstadt 1864. 4.

5) Partitiones oratoriae (or de partitione oratoria), written a. 708 or 709, a survey of the whole department of rhetoric in the form of questions (put by the author's son) and answers; a pretty dry catechism.

1. Quintil. III 3, 7. Drumann VI p. 293.

2. E. Reusch, disquis. de Cic. partt. or., Helmstedt 1723. 4. Piderit, on the criticism of Cic. p. or., Hanau 1866. 4. and in Jahn's Jahrbb. 95 p. 275—283. H. Sauppe, Götti. Gel. Anz. 1867 p. 1863—1877.

3. Editions by Hauptmann (Lips. 1741) and Piderit (Leipz. 1867).

6) Topica ad C. Trebatium, an explanation of Aristotle's Topics, written down from memory a. 710 during a journey.

1. Cic. ad Fam. VIII 19. Quintil. III 11, 18. V 10, 64 (scribens ad Trebatium ex iure ducere exempla maluit).

2. We possess six books of a commentary on it by Boethius (found in his opp. and in many old editions of Cicero's work, also in Orelli).

3. F. G. van Leyden, interpr. iurispr. Tull. in Topp. expositae, Lugd. Bat. 1805. 180 pp. 8. W. A. Macejowski, obss. in Cic. Topp. (Opusc., Warsaw 1824. p. 63—84), Brandis, Rhen. Mus. III (1829) p. 547 sqq. J. Klein, de fontibus Topp. Cic., Bonn 1844. F. Bücheler, Philologus XXI p. 123—126.

7) De optimo genere oratorum, forming the introduction to a translation of Demosthenes' and Aeschines' speeches for and against Ctesiphon, treating of the Attic and the Asiatic style of eloquence; perhaps also of the year 710.

1. Ascon. p. 31 Or.

2. Edited (with Top. and partitt.) by G. H. Saalfrank (Ratisb. 1823) and by O. Jahn in his ed. of the Orator (1859).

170. The four collections of the correspondence of Cicero which have come down to us, counting in 90 letters addressed to Cicero, contain altogether 864 pieces and are both of personal and political contents, an inexhaustible treasure of contemporaneous history, though partly such that their publication was not favorable to Cicero. In the case of a man used to think as rapidly and feel as vividly as Cicero did, and who felt a kind of necessity to give vent to his thoughts and feelings either orally or in letters to a familiar friend like Atticus, a correspondence like this affords a very deep, but sometimes erroneous insight into his heart, and hence Drumann derives the greater part of his materials for his accusation from these letters.

1. The earliest letter dates of 686, the latest of 28 July 711, not a single one being preserved from the time of Cicero's consulship. Fronto ad Antonin. II 5 p. 107 Naber: omnes Ciceronis epistolas legendas censeo, mea sententia vel magis quam omnes eius orationes. epistolis Ciceronis nihil est perfectius. See also above 3 3.

2. B. R. Abeken, Cicero in his Correspondence, Hannover 1835. J. v. Gruber, quaestio de temporibus atque serie epistolarum Ciceronis, Stralsund 1836. 4. A. Stinner, de eo quo Cic. in epistolis usus est sermone, Oppeln 1849. 1854. 1864. 4.

3. Cicero himself never collected and much less edited his letters, but even in his life-time friends of his had a plan of that kind. Comp. ad Att. XVI 5 extr. (a. 710): mearum epistolarum nulla est *συναγωγή*,

sed habet Tiro instar LXX. et quidem sunt a te quaedam sumendae. eas ego oportet perspiciam, corrigam; tum denique edentur; and to Tiro he writes (Fam. XVI 17, 1 a. 708): tuas quoque epistolas vis referri in volumina. After Cicero's death, when his authority was constantly increased by the rhetoricians, his correspondence was very zealously collected and edited, a zeal partly due to publishers' interests. Cornelius Nepos, in a part of his life of Atticus (Att. 16, 3) knows from private communication (for he himself says that they were not yet published) the XVI volumina epistolarum to Atticus, and of a long number of other collections we hear from citations. Macrobius e. g. Sat. II 1, 14 quotes Cicero in libro epistolarum ad Cornelium Nepotem secundo, Nonius Marcellus (ed. Gerlach et Roth) p. 286 a ninth book of letters ad Brutum (ad Brut. I 1, 1), p. 305 a ninth ad Hirtium, p. 201 a fourth ad Pompeium, p. 196 a third ad Caesarem, p. 225 and 289 a third ad Caesarem iuniorem, p. 65 a third ad Pansam, p. 348 a second ad Axium, p. 188 a second ad filium, p. 190 a first (and hence at least also a second) ad Cassium (= ad Fam. XV 16, 3); besides p. 319 ad Calvum (according to Priscian II p. 490, 12 Keil in several books), p. 297 epistola ad Catonem; Suet. rhet. 2 ad M. Titinnium, Quintil. VI 3, 112 ad Caerelliam, Charisius p. 85 P. = p. 110 Keil (quamvis Cicero requietem dixerit) ad Hostilium, ib. p. 108, 26 (Keil) ad Marcellum, to which must be added the ἑλληνικαὶ (*πρὸς Ἡρώδην, πρὸς Πέλοπα τὸν Βυζάντιον* etc.) mentioned by Plut. Cic. 24 (Nake p. 10 sq.) All these collections were probably made in the Augustan period, when very little had perished, but most of the correspondents were dead.

4. Besides these extensive collections we meet also at an early time with a shorter one, the single books of which are generally quoted according to the principal correspondents, e. g. Gell. N. A. I 22, 19 speaking of Pollio's letter to Cicero (Fam. X 33, 5) in libro epistolarum M. Ciceronis ad L. Plancum et (and more exactly) in epistola (M.) Asini Pollionis ad Cic.; comp. Gell. XII 13, 21: in libro M. Tullii Epp. ad Ser. Sulpicum = Fam. IV 4, 4; Non. Marc. v. comedim (p. 83, 30 M. = p. 59 Gerl.): Cicero ad Varronem epistola Peti (i. e. ad Paetum, s. Fam. IX 20, 3), Nonius quoting the letter Fam. XV 16 from the more complete collection (ad Cassium I), which does not, however, prove it to have been in existence in his time. We possess only scanty fragments of the large collections (incompletely collected by Orelli IV 2 p. 461—468, = p. 968—974 ed. sec., see also C. Halm, Contributions to the fragments of Cicero p. 31 sq.), while the short one is extant (ad Fam.)

5. Cicero's letters were diligently read during several centuries (see the list of citations in Nake, histor. crit. p. 38 sq.) and also abridgments made of them (Fronto ad Antonin. II 5. p. 107 Naber: memini me excerpsisse ex Ciceronis epistulis ea dumtaxat quibus inesset aliqua de eloquentia vel philosophia vel de rep. disputatio; praeterea si quid elegantius aut verbo notabili dictum videretur excerpsi); but neither to the same extent nor for the same length of time as the greater part of Cicero's other writings. We find, therefore, only isolated traces of

the existence of mss. of them and of mentions during the middle ages (Orelli's pref. to his ed. p. VI sq.), espec. from the 10th to the 14th century (ib. p. VII—XII; for John of Salisbury ib. p. VII sq., for Peter of Blois ib. p. IX sq.) It was Petrarca who recovered them, in 1345 near Verona the letters to Atticus, Q. Cicero, Brutus and Octavius, and somewhat later the letters ad familiares at Vercelli (comp. Orelli l. l. p. XII sq. XXXIX sq. M. Haupt, duo epistolae ineditae de inventione Ciceronis Epp. ad Fam., Berl. 1856. 4. F. Hofmann, der kritische Apparat etc. p. 1—6. Detlefsen, in Jahn's Jahrb. 87, p. 550 sqq.). The original ms. of the letters ad fam. (saec. XI, the source of all other mss.) is still in existence (Cod. Med. plut. XLIX, Nr. IX), and so is Petrarca's copy (Cod. Medic. pl. XLIX nr. VII); but of the letter ad Atticum etc. the ms. found at Verona has again been lost, only the copy taken by Petrarca being extant (ib. plut. XLIX, cod. XVIII), which also contains numerous corrections by Coluccio Salutato, most of them being conjectures of that scholar, some also emendations derived from a renewed collation of the original ms. (comp. Hofmann p. 6 sq. and 8—25). The cod. Turnesianus, however, (z), about which Lambinus' notes may be relatively depended on, but which is lost now, was not derived from Petrarca's copy (M), see Hofmann p. 26—30, nor is a cod. Escurial. saec. XIV or XV, and similarly the marginal notes in Cratander's edition (c), Basle 1528, seem to be due to some ms. older than the Med. (Fr. Hofmann p. 26. 30—47.), i. e. either to the same ms. as the Würzburg and Munich leaves (Spengel, Munich Gel. Anz. 1846 p. 917 sqq. 926 sqq. Halm, Rh. Mus. XVIII p. 460—463) or one very much like it. On the mss. of the 15th century and the edd. principes of the year 1470 (the Romana and the Jensoniana = R and I) see Fr. Hofmann p. 48—65, and on the history of the ms. tradition of the letters Orelli Prolegg. to T. III of the second edition of his Cicero, with D. Detlefsen in Jahn's Jahr. 87 p. 551—571. A popular work is G. Boissier, sur la manière dont furent recueillies et publiées les lettres de Cicéron, Paris 1863.

6. H. A. Koch, Emendationes Ciceronis Epistolarum, Putbus 1855. 10 pp. 4. Rhein. Mus. XII p. 268—279. F. Bücheler, Contributions to the criticism of Cicero's letters XI p. 509—535. J. Kraus, Cic. Epp. emendationes. I Cöln 1866. 4. Br. Nake, historia critica M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistolarum, Bonn 1861.

7. Two good selections for schools have been made by F. Hofmann (part I, Berlin 1860, Weidmann series), and by Jos. Frey, Leipzig, Teubner. [See also Cicero's Select Letters with English Introductions, Notes and Appendices, by Albert Watson. Oxford, Clarendon Press 1870.]

171. The collections extant are as follows:

1) ad Familiares, 16 books of the years 691—711, arranged according to the persons to whom they are addressed (with the solitary exception of book XII), but without consistent attention to chronology, probably edited by Tiro who

most likely published first twelve books and subsequently added four.

1. The title is doubtful (P. Victorius: M. Tulli Ciceronis epistolarum libri XVI), but certainly not ad Diversos, which is not even Latin.

2. The third book contains only letters to Appius Claudius Pulcher, the eighth only letters of M. Caelius (below 196, 4) to Cicero, book XIV only letters of Cicero to Terentia and the other members of his family, b. XIV exclusively letters to Tiro; b. XIII further letters of recommendation, b. XV addenda to the first twelve books.

3. The collection seems to have been published immediately after Cicero's death, before the abundance of letters was made public from which larger collections were subsequently formed. This is the view held by J. Hofmann, while B. Nake on the other hand maintains the extensive collections to be older, and the existing collection (ad Fam.) to be only an abridgment of them: this is, however, contradicted by the necessity in which we should then be placed of assuming the authors of this abridgment to have been persons of unparalleled stupidity: of the four books ad Pompeium only one letter (Fam. V 7) and of the three ad Caes. only VII 5 sq. being admitted. But the peculiar composition of books XIII and XV seems to necessitate a mediating view as given above. The sentence on Atticus (Fam. XVI 23, 2) would hardly have been made public in Atticus' life-time (he died 722).

4. Was the editor Tiro or Atticus? In favour of Atticus are Tunstall, Epist. ad Middleton. p. 15, Drumann VI p. 409 and Nake p. 32—34, whose only argument against Tiro consists in the defective arrangement of the collection, which may however be attributable to the difficulty of the task and the assumption of a twofold publication. In favour of Tiro are the facts that he intended to publish a collection, and that the 16th book contains some (though insignificant) letters addressed to him and even such as are not by Cicero and others which only treat of him (16); but principally the absence of all letters by Tiro himself, just as in the correspondence with Atticus the letters with Atticus were withdrawn. See F. Hofmann, Select Letters etc. I p. 6—11. A contemporaneous publication of the two collections ad Fam. and ad Attic. seems to be supported by the strict observation of the rule to exclude letters already published in the one from the other (the two exceptions, Fam. VIII 16 = Att. X 9 A; Fam. IX 14 = Att. XIV 17 A only confirming the rule).

5. Editions e. g. by P. Manutius (Ald. 1575. Ven. 1579. 1589 fol.; his notes also published by C. G. Richter, Leipz. 1779. 2 voll.), J. G. Graevius (Amsterdam 1677. 1693 etc., 2 voll.), J. A. Bengel (Stuttg. 1719), Cellarius and Corte (Leipz. 1771 etc.), T. F. Benedict (Leipz. 1790—1795. 2 voll.), J. C. F. Wetzel (Liegnitz 1794), J. A. Martyni Laguna (Vol. I. Lips. 1794. 4. Beginning of his notes in Jahn's Archiv 1833. II. p. 249 sqq. 365 sqq. and with Petri Victorii curae tertiae in Epp. ad Famm. II. edited by Orelli, Zürich 1840. 4.). C. E. C. Schneider,

de cod. Med. Epp. Cic. ad Famm. auctoritate, Breslau 1832. 4. and Iudicium de Cic. Ep. ad Fam. V 12 (Breslau 1837. 4.). Kleijn, Obss. critt. in Cic. Epp. ad Fam., Lugd. Bat. 1860.

6. The letters not by Cicero (Clarorum virorum epist. etc.) with notes by B. Weiske (Lips. 1792). The letters to his family (ad suos) by F. Miesberg, Glogau 1839. Ep. ad L. Lucceium ed. ill. C. H. Frotscher, Annaberg 1838. R. Jacobs, ad Cic. Epp. ad Fam. librum XIII Jahn's Jahrb. 85 p. 732—734. J. Müller, Contributions to the criticism and explanation of Cicero's letters to P. Lentulus, Insbruck 1862. Oudendorpii scholia in selectas Epp. ad Fam. ed. J. A. Liebmann (Lips. 1839). M. Caelii Rufi et M. Tullii Ciceronis Epp. mutuae ed. W. H. D. Suringar, Lugd. Bat. 1845. B. Nake, the correspondence of Cicero and Caelius, Jahn's Jahrbb. 89 p. 60—68, and De M. Caeli Rufi epist. libro, in the Symb. philol. Bonn. p. 373—384. B. Nake, de Planci et Cic. epistulis, Berlin 1866. 4.

2) Ad Atticum, likewise in 12 books, commencing with a. 686 and terminating a few months before Cicero's death, partly as valuable as monologues and frequently so expressed as to be intelligible only to the receiver of the letter. Here, too, the arrangement leaves much to be desired. These letters (without the answers of Atticus) were doubtless not published until after Atticus' death, though at his instigation.

1. Cic. ad Att. VIII 14, 2: ego tecum tanquam mecum loquor.

2. The commencement is inaccurately determined by Corn. Nepos Att. 16: XVI (the mss. XI) volumina epistolarum ab consulatu eius (Cicero) usque ad extremum tempus ad Atticum missarum; the correspondence is characterised ib. 16, 4. The correspondence during the last months of Cicero's life was perhaps suppressed out of regard for Octavianus (see Nake, hist. crit. p. 17, n. 30). Owing to a similar precaution, Atticus' replies were left out, though they are often indispensable to a full understanding of Cicero's letters, and had been carefully preserved by Cicero (ad Att. IX 10, 4 sqq.). The same motive accounts for Atticus' keeping back the publication until after his own death (a. 722), as appears from Corn. Nepos l. l. Some parts, however, of the collection must have perished, e. g. Sen. de brev. vit. 5 quotes from quadam ad Att. epistola a passage not found in our present texts.

3. Editions by P. Manutius (Venet. 1547 and often), P. Victorius (Florence 1571), J. G. Graevius (Amsterd. 1684. 1693. 1727. 2 voll.), J. C. G. Boot (rec. et adn. ill., Amsterdam 1865 sq. 2 voll.)

4. M. Haupt (Berlin Ind. lect. aest. 1855) shows the two pretended mss. of Cicero's letters to Atticus quoted by Sim. Bosius (Crusellinus and Decurtatus) never to have existed and all his statements as to their readings to be mere fictions. Similarly his statements on the Turnesianus should be mistrusted, unless where they are confirmed by Lam-

binus. D. Detlefsen, Fleckeisen's Jahrb. Suppl. III 1 p. 111—131 (Leipzig 1857). Fr. Hofmann, an examination of the critical apparatus on Cicero's letters ad Atticum, Berlin 1863. See also above 170, 5.

3) Ad Quintum fratrem, in 3 books, dating from 694 to 700. Here there is no doubt that we possess all that was ever published.

1. On the disarrangement of some leaves in this collection (and partly also in that ad Att.), see Th. Mommsen, Ztschr. f. AW. 1844. nr. 75 sqq. cf. 1845 n. 98 sq. Orelli p. LXVII of the second edition.

2. Edited by J. Hoffa (Heidelb. 1843), and with ad Brut. by P. Manutius (Frankfort 1580 and elsewhere), Valerius Palerm. (Hagae Com. 1725.)

3. Ep. I — which has all the length and elaborateness of an essay on provincial administration — separately edited by J. Facciolati, Padua 1738.

4) A correspondence between M. Brutus and Cicero, in two books, in a sadly disarranged condition.

1. The letters of the second book relate to the time before the battle of Mutina, those of the first to the time succeeding it. In the first book the letter of condolence on Porcia's death (I 9) is placed before the news of her illness (I 17, 7). I 11 is brought to Rome by Antistius Vetus who is mentioned as already being there I 9, 3, and other mistakes might be easily mentioned.

2. The second book was discovered (in Germany) after the first and edited by Cratander. No ms. containing it is extant.

3. Plut. Brut. 53: *τὸ ἐπιστόλιον (Βρούτου), εἴπερ ἄρα τῶν γνησίων ἐστί.* The spuriousness of both books was first maintained by Tunstall (Cambridge 1741, and Observations on the present collection etc., Lond. 1744), subsequently above all by Markland (Remarks on the epistles etc. Lond. 1745), and F. S. Huldrich (de fide et auctoritate Epp. Cic. et Bruti, Zürich 1797. 4.), while their authenticity was warmly defended by Middleton (London 1743) and in recent times by C. Fr. Hermann, see the latter's Vindiciae latinitatis Ep. Cic. ad Br., Gotting. 1844. 4.; Göttinger gel. Anzeig. 1844. St. 195 sq. 1845. St. 96 sq. p. 961—981; Defence of the authenticity etc., Göttingen 1845 (Abhandl. der Gött. Ges. d. Wiss. II p. 189 sqq. III p. 143 sqq.); Vindiciarum Brutianarum epimetrum, Götti. 1845. 4. Against him A. W. Zumpt, de Cic. et Bruti mutuis ep. quae vulgo feruntur, Berlin 1845. 4. Berl. Jahrb. 1845. II Nr. 91—94. Orelli (note on p. 755 and 775) is of opinion that the first book is of the time of Augustus, and the second of the 15th century. Similarly Niebuhr, Lectures on Roman History, by Schmitz II p. 105 sq., and Fr. Hofmann, l. l. p., 3 sq. believes authenticity possible in the case of the first book, improbable in the second. Nipperdey (Trans. of the Saxon Soc. 1865, p. 71, n. 15) insists on the spuriousness of the two letters in which

Octavianus is abused, I 16 and 17. On the whole, the objections raised against this collection are of small consequence, chiefly the contradictions of confidential judgments of Cicero's on certain persons with the assertions made by him in public or at other times. The simple, style of these letters which is very far from rhetorical turgidity does not favour the assumption of forgery, and quite agrees with Brutus' Attic tendencies. See below 199, 1. The citation in Non. Marcell. p. 286 (Ep. ad Brut. IX = ad Brut. I 1) renders the assumption probable that the present collection is only an abridgment.

5) There is no doubt as to the spuriousness of the letter ad Octavianum, found in the Medicean ms. between the letters ad Quintum fratrem and those ad Atticum.

Some other compositions are so evidently later forgeries that they are now justly omitted in recent editions. See also R. Hercher Philologus IX p. 592.

172. Cicero studied philosophy originally only as a means of assisting his rhetorical training, and not until his last years, when he saw himself stopped in his political and rhetorical career, did he write a number of philosophical works, within a short time and partly to occupy himself and to forget the existing state of things. In these, he rendered his Greek originals in a loose and unmethodical manner, committing even numerous mistakes, e. g. frequently mixing up the Academic and Peripatetic philosophers. His study of the original authorities was on the whole confined to late Greek philosophers, while he had only an imperfect acquaintance with Plato and Aristotle. The most difficult problems he left aside, and he anxiously avoided strict definitions. He was eclectic as to the different systems. He preferred, however, the plausible doctrines of the New Academy on account of their practical utility to a lawyer; in Ethics he inclined to the idealism of the Stoics, though softening down their asperities; he was disgusted with the moral laxity and the lazy indifferentism of the Epicureans. The material value of these works is far surpassed by the merit of their form, Cicero being the first Roman writer who treated philosophical subjects in Latin in a clear and elegant manner and thus became the creator of a philosophical style in Latin. His philosophical writings are, as a rule, conceived as dialogues, though these are somewhat monotonous, this form not being vividly kept up.

1. Paradox. prooem. 2.: nos ea philosophia plus utimur quae peperit dicendi copiam et in qua dicuntur ea quae non multum discrepent ab opinione populari. Cf. Brut. 43, 161. 91, 315. 93, 322. Tusc. IV 4 in. V 29, 82. D. N. I 3—5.

2. ad Att. XII 52 extr.: dices, qui talia conscribis? *Ἀπόγραφα* sunt, minore labore fiunt; verba tantum affero, quibus abundo; cf. Fam. XIII 63 in. He expressly declares that he used his own discretion and taste, de fin. I 2, 6. 3, 7. off. I 2, 6.

3. He quite misunderstands the Platonic Ideas, Orat. 2, 7—10. With regard to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics he says de fin. V 5, 12: quare teneamus Aristotelem et eius filium Nicomachum, cuius accurate scripti de moribus libri dicuntur illi quidem esse Aristotelis, sed non video cur non potuerit patris similis esse filius, words which may well make us doubt whether Cicero had ever seen the work in question, see Madvig's Exc. ad I. For other particulars see Brut. 31, 120. 40, 149. de fin. V 3. 5 extr. 8, 21 (antiquis, quos eosdem Academicos et Peripateticos nominamus), 23 extr. and other passages.

4. On Cicero's philosophical writings see: Brucker, hist. crit. phil. T. II p. 33 sqq. J. G. Zierlein, de philosophia Cic., Halle 1779. 4. Meiners, Miscellaneous Writings I p. 274 sqq. H. C. F. Hülsemann, de indole philosophica Cic., Lüneb. 1799. 4. Ciceronis hist. philosophiae antiquae etc. collegit Fr. Gedicke, Berl. 1815. Herbart, on Cic.'s philosophy, in his minor writings. (Leipz. 1842) I 11. R. Kühner, Cic. in philosophiam merita, Hamb. 1825. Guiard, de Cic. philosophi in cives suos meritis, Landsberg 1832. 4. Ritter and Preller, hist. philosophiae graeco-romanae (Hamburg 1838) p. 416—433. Krische, Investigations concerning ancient philosophy, Götting. 1840. J. A. C. van Heusde, Cic. *φιλοπλάτων*, Utrecht 1836. H. Ritter, History of philosophy IV p. 103 ff. Drumann VI p. 650—677. E. Zeller, Philosophy of the Greeks III 1. p. 574—593. Baumhauer, de Aristotelia vi in Cic. scriptis, Utrecht 1841. Ritt, On Cicero's knowledge of Aristotle, Zerbst 1846. 4. Leglay, Cic. philosophiae historicus, 1846. Kleemann, Cicero's position and merits as a philosopher, 1851. C. Crome, quid Graecis Cicero in philosophia, quid sibi debuerit, Düsseldorf 1855. 4. Burmeister, Cicero as an adherent of the New Academy, Oldenburg 1860. W. Thomas, de Aristotelis *ἐξωτερικοῖς λόγοις* deque Ciceronis Aristotelio more, Göttingen 1860. Bernhard, de Cic. graecae philosophiae interprete, Berlin 1865. 4.

5. The editions of Cicero's philosophical writings by J. Davis (Cambridge 1736 sqq. 6 vols.; ed. Rath, Halle 1804—1820) and J. A. Görenz (Leipz. 1809—1813. 3 vols.) are not complete. In Orelli's Cicero they form vol. IV.

6. L. Vaucher, in Cic. libros philosophicos curae criticae. I. Lausanne 1864.

173. Cicero himself enumerates his philosophical works de divin. II 1. The following is a chronological list of those extant:

1) De republica, forming so to say the transition from Cicero's practical life to philosophical writing, written a. 700 and in the following year, and published before his departure for Cilicia (703), in six books, of which, however, scarcely the third part has come down to us.

1. Cic. de div. II 1, 3: his libris adnumerandi sunt sex de rep., quos tum scripsimus cum gubernacula reip. tenebamus. Comp. ad Fam. VIII 1 extr. Att. V 12, 2. VI 1, 8. de leg. III 2, 4. Tusc. IV 1, 1.

2. The composition of the work may be traced in Cicero's letters. His original plan was to introduce only defunct persons as sharers in the dialogue, but this was changed upon the instigation of Cn. Sallustius, he himself and his brother being now the speakers; subsequently, however, he reverted to his first idea, laid the scene a. 625 and made Africanus minor, Laelius, and others the principal speakers. See ad Qu. fr. III 5 and 6, 1 sq. Richarz, de politicorum Cic. librr. tempore natali, Würzb. 1829. 4. The form of the whole is an attempt to imitate the Platonic dialogues. See Drumann VI p. 83—87.

3. In this work Cicero resorted especially to Plato and Aristotle, but also to Polybius, Theophrastus and others, embodying in it also his personal political experience. M. S. Gratama, de Cic. de rep. et de leg. libris diss. iuridica, Gröningen 1827. J. v. Persijn, de politica Cic. doctrina in libris de rep., Amsterd. 1827. K. S. Zachariä, Political observations on Cicero's book de republica, Heidelberg 1823.

4. Part of the sixth book, the dream of Scipio, has been preserved through Macrobius' Commentariorum in Somnium Scipionis libri duo. Gernhard, de Cic. Somn. Scip. (Weimar 1834 sq.) and in his Opuscc. latt. p. 373 sqq. A Greek translation of it by Planudes edited by C. P. Hess, Cic. Cato etc. ex gr. interpr., Halle 1832. p. 70 sqq., and by Brüggemann, Conitz 1840. 4.

5. The greater part was discovered by A. Mai in a Vatican palimpsest and also edited by him (Rome 1822. 4. and Stuttg. 1822. 8., also in Class. auct. Rome 1828. I p. 1—138 and again Rome 1846), after him by C. G. Schütz (Leipz. 1823), F. Steinacker (Leipz. 1823), C. F. Heinrich (Bonn 1823), G. H. Moser (Frankf. 1826), C. Zell (Stuttg. 1827), F. Osann (Götti. 1847). G. N. du Rieu, Schedae Vaticanae, in quibus retractatur palimpsestus Tullianus de rep. (Lugd. Bat. 1860) p. 1—126 and Giraud, Séances de l'acad. des sc. mor. et pol. 1861, February and March (Philologus XVIII p. 569 sq.). In Orelli's second edition.

2) De legibus, probably commenced a. 702 sq., immediately after the completion of the preceding work, with the purpose of adding *νόμοι* to his *πολιτεία*; resumed 708, but never completed or edited by the author; he never mentions

it in his letters or elsewhere. Originally it may have consisted of six books, of which, however, we possess only three, with a few fragments of the others. Even the extant part has several lacunae, and if Cicero himself had published the work, he would no doubt have added one of the prefaces of which he always had a stock on hand; as it is, the work opens abruptly in the form of a dialogue. The first book which contains a kind of system of natural law is carefully elaborated, but the ideas are somewhat superficial and confused; in the following parts much is only sketched. After Plato, Chrysippus seems to have been his principal guide; in the form of the dialogue he repeated his attempt to imitate Plato; yet throughout the work much attention is paid to the state of law at Rome. The second book treats of the drawing up of laws and the ius sacrum, in which the style of the old laws is successfully imitated; the third is de magistratibus; the fourth was to be de potestatum iure, the fifth perhaps de iure publico, and the sixth de iure civili.

1. The year 702 is also indicated as the time when Cicero began the work by the allusion to historical events (e. g. Cicero's augurship, II 3, 32; the death of Clodius, ib. 17, 42), though there is no absolute reliance on this point, as these allusions may belong to the character of the situation. Then, however, the work was not completed (the interruption being caused by the administration of Cilicia and the Civil Wars); cf. Brut. 5, 19: ut illos de rep. libros edidisti nihil a te sane accepimus, and Tusc. IV 1, 1 de rep. is mentioned, but not de legibus. It was resumed 708, see Fam. IX 2, 5: modo nobis stet .. et scribere et legere *πολιτείας* et, si minus in curia atque in foro, at in litteris et libris .. navare remp. et de moribus ac legibus quaerere. But even then the work was again abandoned, perhaps in consequence of Cicero's increasing interest in systematic philosophy or merely owing to other literary engagements. The preface is wanting against Cic.'s general theory in singulis libris utor prooemiis, ad Att. IV 6, 2, cf. XVI 6. — The original extension to 6 books is partly attested by the analogy of the work de rep., partly by the citation in Macrob. Sat. VI 4, 8: Cicero in quinto de legibus.

2. On the date of composition see, besides the Prolegg. of the various editors, C. Peter in his edition of the Brutus (1839) p. 264—270. Horrmann, de tempore quo Cic. libros de legg. scripsisse videatur, Detmold 1845. 4. In general Th. Kelch, comm. de legg. Cic., Elbing 1826. 4. C. F. Feldhügel, on Cicero's books de legg., Zeitz 1841. 4. Drumann VI p. 104—107. Critical contributions by A. W. F. Krause (Deutsch-Krone 1842. 4. and in Jahn's Archiv XV p. 234—239), C. Halm (Jahn's Jahrb. 79 p. 759—778), J. Vahlen (Ztschr. f. östreich. Gymn.

1860 p. 1—32. 1861 p. 19—24), Reifferscheid (Rhen. Mus. XVII p. 269—296), A. Baumstark (Philologus XIX p. 633—649).

3. Editions by J. Davis (Cambridge 1727. 1745, reprinted by R. G. Rath, Halle 1818. T. V.), J. F. Wagner (Göttingen 1804), J. A. Görenz (Leipz. 1803), G. H. Moser and Fr. Creuzer (Frankf. 1824), J. Bake (Lugd. Bat. 1842), C. F. Feldhügel, (Zeiz 1852 sq. 2 voll.). In Orelli's sec. ed. IV p. 855—924 [the latest edition ex recognitione Joh. Vahleni, Berlin 1871].

3) Paradoxa, written in April 708, immediately after the Brutus, before the arrival at Rome of the news of the death of M. Cato, and previously to the Orator. On account of its smallness the little treatise is not specially mentioned de div. II 1. It contains an exposition, rather rhetorical than philosophical, of six striking theorems of the Stoic system.

1. From the above dates will be understood the rectifications of Parad. 2 implied in de fin. IV 19, 2, and of Parad. 3 in de fin. III 10 sq.

2. Morgenstern, Prolegg. in Cic. P., Dorpat 1819 fol. and in Seebode's Miscell. crit. I 1 p. 386 sqq. Bardili in Hauff's Philology II 2 sqq. Drumann VI p. 288—290. O. Heine, Critical observations on Cic.'s Parad., Philologus X p. 116—125. Detlefsen, on a ms. of Cicero in the Imperial Library, Transactions of the Academy at Vienna, 1855. XXI p. 110—129.

3. Editions by A. G. Gernhard (with Cato, Leipz. 1819), J. Borgers (Lugd. Bat. 1826. 4.), Orelli (with Tusc., Zurich 1829), C. H. Moser (Göttingen 1846); in Orelli IV p. 743—758 ed. II.

4) While in his Paradoxa Cicero as yet occupies the position of a rhetor, the Consolatio, his next philosophical work, was due to a personal motive and domestic calamity, his daughter's death. It was composed a. 709, with the assistance of Crantor's treatise περὶ πένθους, and other Greek works.

1. See ad Att. XII 14, 4. 31 extr. Tusc. I 26 extr. III 31, 76. IV 29, 63. divin. II 1, 3. 9, 22. Plin. N. H. praef. and others.

2. The fragments in Orelli IV 2 p. 489 sq. = p. 989—991. ed. II. see also Halm's Contributions to the fragments of Cicero, p. 32—35. Fr. Schneider, de Consolatione Cic. Breslau 1835. Drumann VI p. 319—321. B. A. Schultz, de Ciceronis Consolatione, Greifswald 1860. 102 pp. 8. — A forgery was M. Tullii Cic. Consolatio. Liber nunc primum repertus et in lucem editus. Colon. 1588. 120 pp. 8.

5) In his Hortensius Cicero furnished a kind of preface to the series of philosophical writings projected by him, in order to justify this occupation in his own eyes and those of others and, if possible, to win successors. The Hortensius being lost

with the exception of a number of fragments, the de finibus is the first professed philosophical work by Cicero we have.

1. Cic. de div. II 1, 1: cohortati sumus ut maxime potuimus ad philosophiae studium eo libro qui est inscriptus Hortensius.

2. The Hortensius was still extant in the 11th century in the island of Reichenau, and in the twelfth in a monastery of Western France (in Abbatia Bevensi). The fragments in Orelli IV 2. p. 478—486 = IV p. 980—987 ed. II, see also Crecelius, Jahn's Jahrb. 75, p. 79 sq. and Halm's Contributions, etc. p. 35—39. Fr. Schneider, Tremesno 1841. 4. Drumann VI p. 322.

6) De finibus bonorum et malorum, in 5 books, written in the first part of 709, immediately before the Academica and dedicated to Brutus, a compilation on the doctrines of the Greek sects concerning the supreme good and evil, one of the main questions of practical philosophy. The work is arranged in three conversations, in which Cicero himself is the central figure, according to the example of Aristotle, all the other speakers being already dead at the time: in the first conversation (books I and II), supposed to take place in 704, they are L. Manlius Torquatus and C. Valerius Triarius, the first of whom explains the Epicurean doctrine (b. I) which is refuted by Cicero in the second book; in the second conversation (books III and IV) assigned to a. 602, a part is taken by M. Porcius Cato, the representative of Stoic doctrine (b. III), which is shown by Cicero to agree in all essential points with that of Antiochus of Ascalon; in the third conversation (b. V), laid a. 675, appear M. Pupius Piso who explains the system of the Academics and Peripatetics, L. Tullius Cicero and others. Cicero does not derive his information from the original sources, least of all from Aristotle and Epicurus, but from later representatives, e. g. Phaedrus, Chrysippus, Antiochus, Carneades, nor is his judgment guided by fixed principles; but in point of careful elaboration this work deserves, perhaps, the first place among the philosophical writings of Cicero.

1. Cic. de div. II 1, 2: cum fundamentum esset philosophiae in finibus bonorum et malorum, perpurgatus est is locus a nobis quinque libris, ut quid a quoque et quid contra quemque philosophum diceretur intellegi posset. ad Att. XIII 12, 3: *περὶ τελῶν σύνταξις*. Cf. ib. 19, 3 sq. 21, 4. XII 6, 2. de legg. I 20. Drumann VI p. 323 sq.

2. In general see the Prolegg. of Görenz and Madvig and others. Göring, primi Cic. de fin. libri descriptio etc., Lübeck 1831. 4. Schnei-

der, Cod. Glogav. in C. d. f. discrep. lectio, Breslau 1841. 4. G. F. Schömann, ad Cic. de fin. libri V, in his Opusc. p. 390—401. Other critical contributions by G. F. Unger (Philologus XX p. 372—377. XXI p. 481—495, P. P. Waldenström (Annotationes, Upsala 1863), L. Vaucher (see 172, 6), D. Böckel (Progr. der Thurgauer Kantonsschule 1863. 4.), O. Heine (Jahn's Jahrb. 94, p. 245—253).

3. Editions by Davis (Cambridge 1728. 1741. Oxford 1809. in Rath's reprint p. I), Bremi (Zürich 1798. I), Görenz (Leipz. 1813), Orelli (with Acadd., Zürich 1827), Fr. Otto (Leipz. 1831), J. N. Madvig (Copenh. 1839) H. Alanus (Dublin 1856); in Orelli IV p. 75—206 ed. II.

7) Academica, written a.709, originally in two books, named after (Q. Lutatius) Catulus and (L. Licinius) Lucullus, besides whom Hortensius and Cicero were introduced as speakers in the first edition; subsequently Cicero substituted Cato and M. Brutus, and upon Atticus' informing him that Varro was offended at Cicero's having never yet dedicated anything to him, the whole work was once more completely re-written, divided into four books and dedicated to Varro. In the second edition Cicero made Varro the exponent of the views of Antiochus and reserved to himself those of Philo. Of the first edition, which had already been copied by Atticus when Cicero resolved to re-write it, the second book (Lucullus) has been preserved, of the second (Academica posteriora) the first part of the first book and various fragments. The Lucullus contains the doctrines of Antiochus and Philo, the Catulus seems to have embraced those of Carneades and a general exposition on the Old and New Academy. The beginning of the second edition contains general observations and a survey of the history of philosophy from Socrates to Arcesilas, the predecessor of Carneades and Philo. Cicero devoted a special exposition to the doctrines of the Academy, because he felt specially attracted by its system, and in the absence of other works, his work is one of our principal sources on it.

1. On the relations of the two editions to each other see especially ad Att. XIII 13, 1: ex duobus libris contuli in quattuor. grandiores sunt omnino quam erant illi, sed tamen multa detracta. . . multo haec erunt splendidiora, breviora, meliora. 16, 1: illam ἀκαδημαϊκὴν σύνταξιν totam ad Varronem traduximus. primo fuit Catuli, Luculli, Hortensii. deinde . . eosdem illos sermones ad Catonem Brutumque transtuli. ecce tuae litterae de Varrone. nemini visa est aptior Ἀντιοχεία ratio. Cf. ib. 12, 3. 18. 19, 3. 5. 21, 4. 32, 3. ad Fam. IX 8. de off. II 2, 8. Quintil. III 6, 64. Above 155, 2.

2. A. C. Ranitz, comm. de libr. Ac., Leipz. 1809. 4. and in Acta sem. Lips. II 1. p. 165—173. Brandis, Rhein. Mus. III p. 543 sqq. Görenz's introduction to his edition. Drumann VI p. 327—330. Krische, on Cicero's Academica, Göttingen 1845. K. F. Hermann, Contributions to the criticism of Cic.'s Lucullus, Philologus VII p. 466—476. C. J. H. Engstrand, de libris Ciceronis academicis, Upsala 1860. 32 pp. 8.

3. Editions by Davis (Cambridge 1725. 1736; in Rath p. III), Fr. Hülsemann (Magdeburg 1806), Görenz (T. II 1810), Orelli (with de fin., Zürich 1827); in Orelli's edition vol. IV p. 1—55 (Lucullus) and p. 56—74 (Acad. post.) cf. p. 854 ed. II.

8) Tusculanae disputationes, so-called after Cicero's estate at Tusculum, where the conversations are supposed to have taken place, and where the work was actually written. It was begun in 709 and finished and edited 710, subsequent to de finibus and anterior to de divinatione and de fato; it is in five books and dedicated to M. Brutus. On its contents, Cicero himself says de divin. II 1, 2: libri Tusculanarum disputationum res ad beate vivendum maxime necessarias aperuerunt. primus enim (liber) est de contemnenda morte, secundus de tolerando dolore, de aegritudine lenienda tertius, quartus de reliquis animi perturbationibus, quintus . . docet ad beate vivendum se ipso esse contentum. His authorities were Plato and the Stoics, in part also the Peripatetics.

1. Cic. ad Att. XIII 32, 2: Dicaearchi περὶ ψυχῆς utrosque velim mittas et Καταβάσεως. Τριπολιτικὸν non invenio et epistolam eius quam ad Aristoxenum misit. tres eos libros maxime nunc vellem; apti essent ad id quod cogito (cf. Tusc. I 11, 24). XV 2, 4: quod prima disputatio Tusculana te confirmat sane gaudeo. 4, 3.

2. Kühner's Prolegg. and Cic. in phil. mer. p. 111 sqq. Drumann VI p. 347 sq. Emendations by A. S. Wesenberg (Viborg 1830. 1841. 1843 sq. 4. Bake (Schol. hypomn. IV). O. Heine, de Cic. Tusc. dispp. Halle 1854. 8. Bogen, de locis aliquot e Cic. Tusc. etc. Neuss 1856. 4. 1861. 4. J. Schlenger, Coniecturae in etc. Philologus XII p. 280—292. H. Muther and O. Heine, on Cic. Tusc., in Jahn's Jahrb. 85, p. 491—501. J. Jeep, de locis quibusdam Tusc. quaestiones criticae, Wolfenbüttel 1865. 4. H. Muther, on the (rhetorical) composition of the first and fifth books of Cicero's Tusc., Coburg 1862. 4. O. Heine, de fontibus Tusc. disp., Weimar 1863. 4.

3. Editions by Davis (Cambridge 1709. 1723. 1730. 1738. Oxford 1805, in Rath p. II), F. A. Wolf (Leipz. 1792. 1807. 1825), R. Kühner (Jena 1829, 1835. 1846. 1853), Orelli (with the Paradoxa, Zürich 1829), R. Klotz (Leipz. 1835. Addenda and Corrigenda, Leipzig 1843), G. H. Moser (3 vols., Hannover 1836 sqq.), P. H. Tregder (Copenh. 1841), C.

Jourdain (Paris 1842), C. F. Süpfle (Mannheim 1845), G. Tischer (Weidmann Series 1850 sqq.; fifth edition, by G. Sorof, 1868), G. A. Koch (two parts, Hannover 1854. 1857); Orelli-Baiter (IV p. 207—368 ed. II); M. Seyffert (emend., comment. criticos adi., Lips. 1864), O. Heine, Leipzig, Teubner, 1864).

9) Timaeus, a free reproduction of Plato's dialogue, the outward dressing being changed; written after the Academica, a. 709 or 710.

1. Priscian. XII p. 1220 P. = p. 463, 19 sq. Htz.: Cicero in Timaeo. Probably this translation was intended to form part of a large work in which Nigidius Figulus was to represent the Pythagorean doctrine (Hermann p. 8. 13 sq.) The fragment extant see in Orelli IV 2. p. 495—513. = IV p. 995—1010 ed. II.

2. Drumann VI p. 353 sq. K. F. Hermann, disp. de interpretatione Timaei Plat. dial. a Cic. relicta, Göttingen 1842. 4.

10) De deorum natura, in 3 books, written in 710, after the Tusculanae, though already commenced in 709. This work is also dedicated to M. Brutus. The conversation is supposed to have taken place in the feriae Latinae of a. 677, C. Velleius representing the Epicureans, Q. Lucilius Balbus the Stoics, and C. Aurelius Cotta the Academics. This work also is made up of excerpts put into the form of dialogues, but it shares with the rest of this class the merit of having enriched the language for the purpose of rendering Greek ideas. The principal authority for the first book (the Epicurean system of the philosophy of religion) was the work of the Epicurean Phaedrus *περὶ θεῶν*. For criticizing the Epicureans Cicero employed a work of the Stoic Posidonius on that point, and for the second book (the doctrine of the Stoics) the works of Cleanthes, Chrysippus, and Zeno; for the third, the Academics Carneades and Clitomachus — nothing but late and partly insincere sources. Hence the style is sometimes confused, and the criticism frequently misses the main points.

1. Cic. de div. II 1, 3: quibus (Tusc.) editis tres libri perfecti sunt de natura deorum. ad Att. XIII 39, 2: libros mihi .. mittas, et maxime *Φαίδρου περὶ θεῶν* et *Παλλάδος*. Drumann VI p. 349 sq.

2. P. van Weselen-Scholten de philosophiae Cic. loco qui est de divina nat., Amsterd. 1783. 4. (Franke,) on the philosophical character of Cicero's books de n. d., Altona and Leipzig 1799. Kindervater, a philosophical Essay on Cicero de n. d., Leipzig 1790. A. B. Krische, Investigations concerning ancient philosophy, I p. 34 sqq. E. Müller,

Cic. libris de N. D. non extremam manum accessisse, Bromberg 1839. 4. Schultze, spec. codd. Lagomars. de n., Liegnitz 1847. 4.

3. Editions by J. Davis (Cambr. 1718. 1723. 1733. 1744. Oxf. 1807, bei Rath T. VI.), Kindervater (Lips. 1796), Wideburg (Helmst. 1811), Heindorf (Lips. 1815), G. H. Moser and F. Creuzer (Lips. 1818; abridged by Moser, Lips. 1821), C. G. Schütz (Halae 1820), Ast (Monac. 1829), H. Alanus (Lond. 1836), G. F. Schömann (Weidmann Series 1850 sqq. 3 ed.), Orelli-Baiter IV p. 369—480 ed. II. Critical observations by Schömann (Opusc. III p. 274—279. 280—383), Heidtmann (Neustettin 1858. 4.), I. Becker (comm. critt., Büdingen 1856. 4.), R. Klotz (adn. critt. P. I—III. Lips. 1867. 1868. 4.).

4. An unsuccessful attempt at imposition was made in Cic. de N. D. liber quartus etc. ed. P. Seraphinus (i. e. the Superintendent H. H. Cludius at Hildesheim, † 1835; according to others Ph. Marheineke), Bonn 1811.

11) Cato maior or de senectute, dedicated to Atticus and written at the commencement of the year 710. The dialogue is supposed to have taken place a. 604, but may more justly be styled a continuous lecture in praise of old age, on the basis of materials compiled from Plato, Xenophon, Hippocrates, the Stoic Aristo, and others, while Cicero takes special pains with the delineation of Cato's character.

1. Cic. de div. II 1, 3: interiectus est etiam nuper liber is quem ad nostrum Atticum de senectute misimus. ad Att. XIV 21, 3: legendus mihi saepius est Cato maior ad te missus. amariorem enim me senectus facit. XVI 3, 1: idem *σύνταγμα* misi ad te retractatius et quidem *ἀρχέτυπον* ipsum crebris locis inculcatum et refectum.

2. W. Richter, de laudandis et vituperandis in Cic. de sen., Guben 1803. P. J. van der Ton, C. m. explicatur et e graecis potiss. fontibus illustr., Löwen 1821. 206 pp. 4. and comm. ad quaest. de Cic. Cat., Löwen 1822. 4. Nassau, adnotatt. in libr. Cic. de sen., Gröningen 1829. Drumann VI p. 350 sq.

3. Th. Mommsen, on a Leiden ms. of Cic. C. m., Monthly transactions of the Academy at Berlin 1863, p. 10—21. J. G. Sauppe, a Rheinau cod. of C. m., Philologus XXI p. 535—539. 675—679. G. Lahmeyer, on the Leiden and Rheinau mss. of Cic. C. m., Philologus XXIII p. 473—481, see XXI p. 284—307. See also Rüdiger, Berl. Zeitschr. f. Gymn. 1864, p. 798 sq. J. Mähly, New Swiss Mus. VI (1866). p. 243—250.

4. Editions by J. F. Wetzel (Liegnitz 1792. 1808 with Lael.), J. A. Götz (with Somn., Nürnb. 1801), A. G. Gernhard (with Parad., Lips. 1819), P. A. Reijnders (with Lael., Gröningen 1825), F. W. Otto (Lips. 1830), R. Klotz (Leipz. 1831), J. B. Hutter (München 1832), J. J. de Gelder (Lugd. Bat. 1832), J. N. Madvig (Copenh. 1835), G. Tischer (Halle 1847), J. Sommerbrodt (Weidmann Series 1851 sqq.) five edd., C. Nauck (Berlin 1855),

G. Lahmeyer (Leipz., Teubner, 2 edd.), G. Long (New-York 1861); Orelli IV p. 584—611 ed. II.

5. Of the Cato maior we possess a Greek translation by Th. Gaza, edited by Hess p. 3 sqq.

12) De divinatione, in two books, a supplement of the work on the nature of the gods, in which the subject of divine revelation and its perception by mankind is treated of; published a. 710, after the Cato maior and subsequent to Caesar's death, and represented as a conversation at the villa at Tusculum between Cicero and his brother. The first book contains the doctrine of the Stoics (compiled from Chrysippus' περὶ χρησμῶν, περὶ μαντικῆς, Diogenes and Antipater), the second the tenets of the Academicians (where Carneades is principally followed, though also the Stoic Panaetius is used). The popular notions and the political corporations connected with them are leniently dealt with, but even in his quality of Augur, Cicero furnishes much valuable material, though his personal scepticism is sufficiently evident in the frequently humorous mode of treating his subject.

1. Definition of divinatio I 5, 9: earum rerum quae fortuitae putantur praedictio atque praesensio; see Gell. N. A. IV 11, 1.

2. Tennemann, History of Philosophy V p. 121 sqq. Drumann VI p. 352. Höfig, on Cicero's views on public religion, Krotoschin 1865. 4.

3. Editions by Davis (Cantabr. 1721. 1730. 1740; ed. Rath, Halle 1807), J. J. Hottinger (Lips. 1793), G. H. Moser (Frankf. 1828), L. Giese (Lips. 1829), H. Alanus (Lond. 1839); Orelli IV p. 481—566 ed. II.

13) De fato, the last of the treatises on the philosophy of religion, and likewise written a. 710. The author impugns the views of the Stoics on the εἱμαρμένη, taking himself the side of the Academicians. This treatise has come down to us in a mutilated form. As his authorities Cicero mentions Chrysippus, Posidonius, Cleanthes, Diodorus, Carneades, and others. The de fato is valuable as a collection of materials, but the style betrays hurry and the writer does not arrive at any settled results.

1. Cic. de div. II 1, 3: quibus (de n. d. and de divin.), ut est in animo, de fato si adiunxerimus, erit abunde satisfactum toti huic quaestioni. de fat. 1, 2: Hirtius noster, cos. designatus .. post interitum Caesaris. Gell. VII (VI) 2, 15. Macrob. Sat. (II 12 =) III 16, 4. Drumann VI p. 353 sq.

2. Editions (together with de divin.) by Davis, Moser, Alan; especially by J. H. Bremi (Lips. 1795). Orelli IV p. 567–583 ed. II.

3. Nuovi frammenti del libro di Cicerone de fato di recente scoperti in pergamene palimpseste, dal Ch. Cav. L. Crisost. Ferrucci, Modena 1853. 4. His pretended discovery is printed (p. 469—472) and deservedly exposed (by F. Ritschl) in the Rhen. Mus. IX 473—477. XIII p. 163—173. See also F. W. Schneidewin, Göttinger gel. Anz. 1853, p. 1917—1926. G. Linker, Zeitschrift für die östereich. Gymn. V (1854.) p. 81—84. 423—425. H. Alanus, in fragmenta libri Cic. de f. quae nuper Modenae edita sunt observationes, Dublin 1854.

14) Laelius or de amicitia, inscribed to Atticus, written after the Cato maior and previously to the work on the duties, like them in the year 710. The conversation is conducted by Laelius the younger and his sons-in-law, C. Fannius Strabo and Q. Mucius Scaevola, the subject being treated in connexion with the recent death of Africanus minor, the intimate friend of Laelius. Cicero has largely availed himself of Theophrastus' work on the same subject, also of Chrysippus and the Ethics of Aristotle. Some fault may be found with the logical arrangement of the treatise, but on the whole it is interesting and practical.

1. Cic. off. II 9, 31: de amicitia alio libro dictum est. Gell. XVII 5, 1: Cicero in dialogo cui titulus est Laelius vel de amicitia. ib. I 3, 10: eum librum (Theophrastus' *περὶ φιλίας*) M. Cicero videtur legisse cum ipse quoque librum de amicitia componeret.

2. Gernhard, quaedam ad recognoscenda ea quae Cic. in Lael. disp. pertinentia, Weimar 1823. 4. (Opusc. p. 323 sqq). Vogel, collatio trium codd. mss. Cic. de am. Monacensium, Zweibrücken 1839. O. F. Kleine, Adnott. in Cic. Cat. mai. et Laelium, Wetzlar 1855. 10 pp. 4. See also C. E. Putsche, Philologus XII p. 293—301. Th. Mommsen, de Laelii Cic. codice Didotiano (saec. IX—X), Rhein. Mus. XVIII p. 594—601.

3. Editions by Wetzel (with Cato, s. p. 299), J. G. Lenz (Hildburgh. 1778), A. G. Gernhard (Lips. 1825), C. Beier (Lips. 1828), J. B. Hutter (Augsb. 1833), R. Klotz (Lips. 1833), M. Seyffert (Brandenb. 1844 sq. 2 parts), C. W. Nauck (Weidmann Series 1852 sqq., fifth ed. 1867), G. Lahmeyer (Leipzig, Teubner 1861); Orelli IV p. 612—640 ed. II.

15) De gloria in two books, finished at the close of the year 718.

1. Cic. de off. II 9, 31: nunc dicamus de gloria, quamquam ea quoque de re duo sunt nostri libri. cf. ad Att. XV 27, 2. XVI 2, 6. 6, 4. Gell. XV 6, 1. Drumann VI p. 355 sq. Fr. Schneider, Meletemata in Cic. de gl. libros, Ztschr. f. AW. 1839, Nr. 28 sq.

2. This treatise was read by Petrarca (Epist. XV 1), and some scholars of the 15th century (e. g. Franc. Philelphus and P. Alcyonius) were accused of having used it for their own writings and then burnt it. See Hand in Ersch and Gruber I 17 p. 238. For the fragments see Orelli IV 2. p. 487 sq. = IV p. 988 sq. ed. II.

16) De officiis, in three books, addressed by Cicero to his son. This work also is due to the leisure forced upon Cicero by Mark Antony subsequent to Caesar's death, a. 710, and like its fellows, was written off rather rapidly. Cicero's principal authorities were the Stoics, especially Panaetius in the first two books, Posidonius in the third, besides them Diogenes of Babylon, Antipater of Tyre, Hecaton, also Plato and Aristotle. The whole is seasoned and enlivened with numerous illustrations from Roman history, a feature which occasions some unevenness of treatment. The moral views are those of a practical politician, and for this very reason not much higher than the conventional Roman standard.

1. Off. I 2, 6: sequimur . . potissimum Stoicos, non ut interpretes, sed, ut solemus, e fontibus eorum iudicio arbitrioque nostro quantum quoque modo videbitur hauriemus. cf. II 24, 86. III 2, 7. 12, 51 sq. 15, 63. 23, 89. 91. ad Att. XV 13, 6: nos hic φιλοσοφοῦμεν (quid enim aliud?) et τὰ περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος magnifice explicamus προσφωνοῦμενque Ciceroni. XVI 11, 4: τὰ περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος, quatenus Panaetius, absolvi duobus. illius tres sunt. . . eum locum Posidonius persecutus. ego autem et eius librum arcessivi et ad Athenodorum Calvum scripsi ut ad me τὰ κεφάλαια mitteret. Gell. XIII 28 (27), 1.

2. Garve, Philosophical observations and treatises (6. ed., Breslau 1819). R. G. Rath, Cic. de off. in brevi conspectu, Halle 1803. Fr. Binkes, de analysi et constitutione doctrinae in etc., Lugd. Bat. 1819. Lilie, de stoicorum philosophia morali, ad Cic. librr. de off., Alt. 1800. Thorbecke, principium philosophiae mor. e Cic. opp. phil. exp., Lugd. Bat. 1817. J. F. Sachse, de libror. Cic. etc. indole atque proposito, Quedlinb. 1825. 4. R. Kühner, Cic. mer. p. 108 sqq. Drumann VI p. 357—359. Grysar, Prolegg. ad Cic. libr. de off., Cologne 1844. 4. Dahlbäck, de Off. Cic. comm., Upsala 1860. A. Desjardins, les Devoirs, essai sur la morale de Cicéron, Paris 1865.

3. Critical observations by J. Heller (Philologus XIII p. 302—315), H. Sauppe (Coniect. Tull., Gott. 1857. 4.), G. F. Unger (Philologus Suppl. III p. 3—106), W. Maler (nonnulli loci ex . . tractantur, s. l. et a. Carlsr. 1867?).

4. Editions by J. G. Graevius (Amsterd. 1688. 1710. Naples 1771. Graevii scholia in Cic. off. prim. ed. Röther, Wittenberg 1824), J. Facciolati (Padua 1720. Venice 1747, like Graevius, together with the minor treatises) J. F. Heusinger, (Brunsw. 1783; repet. suisq. animadvss. auxit C. Th. Zumpt, Brunsw. 1838), J. F. Degen (Berl. 1800. 1820. 1825; 4. ed.,

by E. Bonnell, Berl. 1848), A. G. Gernhard (Lips. 1811), C. Beier (Lips. 1820 sq. 2 vols. with Indd. Lips. 1831), G. Olshausen (Schlesw. 1823), R. Stürenburg (Lips. 1834. 1843), C. G. Zumpt, Brunswick 1837. 1849), O. Bredberg (Copenh. 1839), C. Wordsworth (London 1841), H. Alanus (Dublin 1841), G. F. W. Lund (Copenh. 1849), G. F. Unger (Leipzig 1852), J. v. Gruber (Leipzig, Teubner 1856. 1866), O. Heine (Berlin, Weidmann, 1857 sqq. 3 edd.); Orelli IV p. 641—742 ed. II.

17) De virtutibus, most probably (on account of its similar contents) written not much before or after the work on human duties, i. e. in the year 710.

Hieron. in Zach. 1, 2. Augustin. de trin. XIV 11. Charis. II p. 186 P. = p. 208, 15 sq. K. Orelli IV 2. p. 492 — IV p. 992 sq. ed. II. Drumann VI p. 359.

No fixed date can be assigned to the following philosophical works of which we possess only fragments:

18) A translation of Xenophon's Oeconomicus in three books, done at the age of about 20 years.

Comp. Cic. de off. II 24, 87. de sen. 17, 59. Plin. N. H. XVIII 25, 60. Gell. N. A. XV 5, 8. Macrob. Sat. (II 16 =) III 20, 5. Serv. on Georg. I 43. Hieron. apol. adv. Ruf. II p. 227 Bas. The fragments may be found in Orelli IV 2. p. 472—477 = IV p. 974—979 ed. II.

19) A translation of Plato's Protagoras, in all probability a work of Cicero's early years.

Van Heusde, Cic. *φιλοπλάτων* p. 92 sqq. Drumann VI p. 354, n. 74. Orelli l. l. p. 477 = IV p. 979.

20) De auguriis, of unknown date, though at all events later than 703, when Cicero became an augur.

According to Drumann VI p. 352 sq. it was composed a. 710, after the treatise de divin. The fragments will be found in Orelli IV p. 980 ed. II. Charis. p. 98. 112 P. = 122, 22. 139, 11 K. de auguriis, cf. augurales libri in Serv. Aen. V 738.

174. In the department of jurisprudence, just as in philosophy, Cicero was a mere amateur, though well-informed. He was too much of an orator and too little accustomed to strict definitions to find in it a welcome field for the display of his powers. For all that, he composed a treatise de iure civili in artem redigendo, which he perhaps originally intended to form the sixth book of the de legibus, and which he treated by itself on failing to complete that work.

1. Ad Fam. VII 30, 2, in defining proprius, Cicero mixes up the notions of possession and property. On Cicero's knowledge of jurisprudence see the writings of A. Schulting (Opuscc., Franeker 1708 etc.), Bynkershoek (Opuscc. II p. 60), J. G. Hornemann (Lips. 1797. 4.), also J. L. E. Püttmann (Miscell., Lips. 1783 p. 143 sqq.), F. A. van der Mark, de meritis Cic. circa iūs naturae, Gröningen 1797; G. Dedel, Cic. doctrina de iure etc. in the Annal. Acad. Gron. (Gröningen 1824. 4.), Bach, hist. iurisprud. rom. p. 258 sqq. Zimmern, History of Roman Private Law I 1 p. 288—290. Drumann VI p. 644—450. Platner, de partt. Cic. rhett. quae ad ius spectant, Marburg 1829. 4. G. de Caqueray, Explication des passages de droit privé contenus dans les oeuvres de Cicéron, Rennes 1857. XV and 601 pp. 8. A. Desjardins de scientia civili apud Cic., Beauvais 1858.

8. Quintil. XII 3, 10: componere aliqua de iure coeperat. Gell. I, 22, 7: M. Cicero in libro qui inscriptus est de iure civili in artem redigendo. Compare also Cicero's judgment of himself, de or. II 33, 142 sqq., where he disguises himself under the mask of Crassus (see above 139, 3): est nobis pollicitus ius civile, quod nunc diffusum et dissipatum esset, in certa genera coacturum et ad artem facilem redacturum. H. E. Dirksen, Trans. of the Berlin Academy (on Hist. and Philol.) 1842 (Berlin 1844) p. 177 sqq. Drumann VI p. 107 sq. Orelli IV p. 979 sq. ed. II.

175. Cicero attempted even historical composition, and de leg. I 2 sq. (see also de or. II 12—15) he sharply criticizes the style of the historians of the time, hinting that he himself was qualified to introduce a great change in this department. It is true that Cicero possessed an unusual fund of historical knowledge, and this is fully displayed in his orations as well as in his philosophical and rhetorical writings, above all, in his Brutus: but here also his rhetorical bent and the difficulty he experienced in losing sight of his own self were much against him, and many casual expressions prove his lax opinions as to the real task of the historian. It appears credible that, had he lived longer, he might have turned to this branch of literature; as it is, he wrote only memoires on his consulship, a Secret History (which was, perhaps, never finished), and Admiranda — all which writings have been lost.

1. Plut. Cic. 41: *διανοούμενος, ὡς λέγεται, τὴν πάτριον ἱστορίαν γραφῇ περιλαβεῖν καὶ πολλὰ συμμῖξαι τῶν ἑλληνικῶν καὶ ὅλους τοὺς εἰρημένους λόγους αὐτῶν καὶ μύθους ἐνταῦθα γράψαι* etc. Cornel. Nep. fragm. Guelf.: ille (Cic.) fuit unus qui potuerit et etiam debuerit historiam digna voce pronuntiare, quippe qui oratoriam eloquentiam rudem

a maioribus acceptam perpoliverit, philosophiam ante eum incomptam latinam sua conformarit oratione.

2. Though Cicero is fully aware primam esse historiae legem ne quid falsi dicere audeat (de or. II 15, 62 cf. ib. 62—64), he acts differently. To quote an instance, of Lucceius he expects (ad Fam. VI 2, 3): amori nostro plusculum etiam quam concedit veritas largiare; and orat. 11, 37. 20, 66 (cf. 36, 124) he places historiae in the *γένος ἐπιδεικτικόν* of eloquence, nor would he seem to know any other kind of historical composition than that of the school of Isocrates. For other remarks see above 31, 5.

3. Drumann VI p. 677—680. J. G. Linsen and S. G. Bergh, de Cic. historico, Abo 1826. 4. Schwegler, Hist. of Rome I p. 93—96. F. D. Gerlach, the Roman historians p. 96 sq.

4. Commentarius consulatus sui graece compositus (ad Att. I 19, 10. II 1 in.), written a. 694 (ad Att. l. l.), at which period Cicero was also busy with a Latin treatise on the same subject (ad Att. I 19, 10). Cf. Plut. Caes. 8. Cass. Dio XLVI 21.

5. *Ἀνέκδοτα*, commenced as early as 695 (ad Att. II 6, 2), resumed after the death of Caesar on Atticus' advice (ad Att. XIV 14, 5. 17, 6. XV 2, 2. 4, 3. 13, 3. 27, 2. XVI 2, 6) and edited after the author's death. According to Dio XXXIX 10 (cf. XLVI 8) this *βιβλίον ἀπόρρητον* is one and the same with the *τῶν ἑαυτοῦ βουλευμάτων ἀπολογισμός* or the ratio (Charis. I p. 146, 31 sq. K.) or expositio consiliorum suorum (Ascon. in or. in tog. cand. p. 83 Or. Augustin. contra Iulian. Pelag. V 5. Orelli IV 2 p. 491 = IV p. 992 ed. II). See Drumann VI p. 360 sq.

6. Admiranda (Plin. N. H. XXXI 8, 2. 28, 1), of unknown date. The fragments in Orelli IV 2 p. 493 sq. = IV p. 994 ed. II.

7. Priscian VI 16, 83 p. 267, 5 Htz.: Cicero in Chorographia, with the readings ortogr., hortogr., cosmogr., chosmogr., chronogr., and cronogr. Acting upon Atticus' advice, Cicero had actually studied geography a. 695; see ad Att. II 4, 1. 3. ep. 6. 7. 9 sq. 12, 3. 14, 2.

8. There are also apocryphal writings like de notis (Orelli IV p. 993), Synonyma, the composition of an anonymous grammarian of some interest for Cicero's style and phraseology (Orelli IV p. 1063 sq. W. L. Mahne, Cic. quae vulgo feruntur Synonyma ad L. Veturium secundum editiones Romanas denuo excudi curavit, Lugd. Bat. 1851. 8. and: secundum editionem Parisinam denuo exc. cur., ib. 1851. 8.) and others. A collection of Cicero's puns (liber iocularis) is mentioned by Quintil. VI 3, 5. VIII 6, 73. See Klotz, Fragm. p. 295 sqq. C. Halm, Contributions etc. p. 39.

176. In poetry Cicero was little more than a common versifier, though owing to his formal talent metrical composition was very easy to him and he even practised it to

form his style. At a later period, his ardent desire of fame induced him to make himself and his life the subjects of epic composition, though greatly to the disadvantage of his reputation.

1. On Cicero's poetry see Sen. Exc. Controv. III. praef. 8. Sen. de ira III 37, 5. Tac. dial. 21. Juvenal X 124 sq. Martial. II 89, 3 sq. Plut. Cic. 40. Schol. Bob. p. 306 Or. Drumann VI p. 681—684. J. F. Jugler, de poesi Cic., Lips. 1744. 4. J. Baden, de poetica facultate Cic., Copenh. 1789 and in his Opuscc. (Copenhagen 1793) p. 421 sqq. F. M. Frantzen, de Cic. poeta, Abo 1800. van Heusde, Cic. *φιλοπλάτων* (Utrecht 1836) p. 25 sqq. 34 sqq. V. Faguet, de poetica Ciceronis facultate, Poitiers 1857.

2. His early attempts. Plut. Cic. 2: *ἐρρύη πως προθυμότερον ἐπὶ ποιητικήν, καί τι ποιημάτιον ἔτι παιδὸς αὐτοῦ διασώζεται, Πόντιος Γλαῦκος, ἓν τετραμέτρῳ πεποιημένον.* Jul. Capitol. Gordian. 3, 2: adolescens cum esset Gordianus . . poemata scripsit . . et quidem cuncta illa quae Cicero, i. e. Marium (so Peter instead of et de merio or ex de merio) et Aratum et Halcyonas (hence may be the two hexameters in Non. p. 65, v. praevius) et Uxorium et Nilum (Casaubonus: Limona, see n. 3). quae quidem ad hoc scripsit ut Ciceronis poemata nimis antiqua viderentur. — Serv. on Verg. Ecl. I 58: Cicero in elegeia quae Talea Masta (Talemasta, taliamastas, talia mastas, thalamasta) inscribitur: (follows a hexameter). R. Unger, Subsicivorum capita tria (Friedland 1854. 4.), c. 1 (de Ciceronis quibusdam carminibus) proposes Cinna in the place of Cicero and Halimastys for Talemastis. Urlichs, Eos I (1864) p. 151 conjectures: in elegia quae Italia maesta inscribitur, which he assumes to be the same as the epic poem de suis temporibus. On the epic poem Marius, of the year 667, see ad Att. XII 49, 1. de leg. I 1, 1 sq. Drumann V p. 221. Orelli IV 2 p. 567 = IV p. 1048. — On Cicero's metrical translation of Aratus' *Φαινόμενα* and *Διοσημεῖα*, of which we still possess large pieces, see Orelli IV 2 p. 516—556 = IV p. 1014—1033 ed. II. G. Schulz, quaestiones criticae ad Cic. Aratea, Neuruppin 1868. 4. Cicero translated also some pieces of Homer, see de fin. V 18, 49. Orelli p. 514 sq. = 1012 sq.

3. Besides this, Suet. Ter. 5 quotes from Cicero in Limone (*Λειμών*, Pratum) four hexameters on Terence (cf. Ritschl in Reifferscheid's Suetonius p. 524); epigrams are quoted by Pliny Epp. VII 4, 3 and Quintil. VIII 6, 73.

4. Quintil. XI 1, 24: in carminibus utinam pepercisset (had not indulged in such self-laudation) quae non desierant carpere maligni. Here should be mentioned his three books de suo consulatu in epic metre, of a. 694. See ad Att. II 3, 3. cf. I 19, 10. de div. I 11 sqq. Orelli IV 2 p. 568—570 = IV p. 1048—1051. Drumann V p. 601 sq. J. Mähly, Philologus XXV p. 544—551. Also the epic poem (written a. 699) on the time of his exile (de temporibus meis), likewise in three books. Cf.

ad Fam. I 9, 23. ad Qu. fr. III 1, 24. II 15, 2. 16, 5. Att. IV 8b, 3. Drumann VI p. 20 sq. Orelli IV p. 1051 sq. — A. 700, Cicero also wrote a panegyric poem on Caesar; ad Qu. fr. III 1, 11 (poëma ad Caesarem). Cf. 4, 4. 8, 3. 9, 6 (ἔπος ad Caesarem). II 15, 2. It is, however, extremely doubtful whether it was ever finished. See Drumann III p. 322.

5. The didactic poem Orpheus, or de adulescente studioso, which pretends to have been written by Cicero for his son, then a student at Athens, is a forgery: see A. Weichert, de L. Var. etc. p. 297.

6. The fragments of Cicero have been collected by Andr. Patricius (fragm. ed. illustr., Venet. 1565. 4.), Orelli, Nobbe-Klotz; F. Schneider de Cic. fragm., Tremesno 1844. 4. C. Halm, Contributions to the emendation and completion of the fragments of Cicero, Munich 1862. 8. (extract from the transactions of the Munich Academy).

177. Cicero's younger brother, Quintus (a. 652—711), took much interest in literature, especially in historiography and poetry, and seems to have resembled his brother in facility of composition. He wrote Annals and a number of tragedies which, however, he seems to have translated from the Greek. We possess by him the epistle de petitione consulatus and several letters.

1. The official career of Q. Cicero seems to justify the assumption of 652 as the year in which he was born. He was aedile 689, praetor 692, governed Asia from 693 to 696, was Pompey's legate in Sardinia 698, Caesar's in Gaul and Britain 700—702, his brother's in Cilicia 703, was with the latter proscribed, and killed together with his son 711; see Drumann, Hist. of Rome VI p. 719—751. C. H. Blase, de Q. Tullii Cic. vita, Cologne 1847. 4. A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 2234—2240.

2. Schol. Bob. on Cic. p. Arch. 2 p. 354 Or.: fuit enim Q. Tullius non solum epici verum etiam tragici carminis scriptor. Cic. ad Att. II 16, 4 (a. 695): Q. frater . . me rogat ut Annales suos (in metrical form?) emendem et edam. ad Q. fr. II 13, 4 (a. 700): Callisthenem et Philistum . . in quibus te video volutatum . . sed quod adscribis: aggrederisne ad historiam? me auctore potes. 16, 4 (a. 700): o iucundas mihi tuas de Britannia litteras! . . te vero ὑπόθεσιν scribendi egregiam habere video. quos tu situs, quas naturas rerum et locorum, quos mores, quas gentes, quas pugnas, quem vero ipsum imperatorem habes! (Hence we may conclude that it was intended to become an epic poem.) ego te libenter . . adiuvabo et tibi versus quos rogas . . mittam. III 4, 4 (a. 700): sine ulla mehercule εἰρωνείᾳ loquor, tibi istius generis in scribendo priores partes tribuo quam mihi. III 5 and 6, 7 (a. 700): quattuor tragoedias XVI diebus absolvisse cum scribas tu quidquam ab alio mutuaris? et πλέον (? set πάθος Usener, Rhein. Mus. XXII p. 460)

quaeris cum Electram et Trodam (Troadem? Troilum?) scripseris? . sed et istas et Erigonam mihi velim mittas. ib. 1, 13: in ea (epistola) nihil erat novi praeter Erigonam, quam si . . accepero scribam ad te quid sentiam; nec dubito quin mihi placitura sit. 9, 6: ne accidat quod Erigonae tuae, cui soli Caesare imperatore iter ex Gallia tutum non fuit. There was an Ἠριγόνη by Sophocles. Cic. de fin. V 1, 3: tum Quintus: . . Sophocles . ., quem scis quam admirer quamque eo delecter. ad Q. fr. II 16, 3 (a. 700): Συνδείπνους Σοφοκλέους, quamquam a te actam fabellam video esse festive, nullo modo probavi. ad Fam. XVI 8, 2: ego (Q.) certe singulos eius (Euripides) versus singula ἀληθείας (?) testimonia puto.

3. Three letters of Q. Cicero to Tiro, ad Fam. XVI 8 (a. 705). 26 sq. (a. 710), and one (ib. XVI 16) to his brother Marcus (a. 700). His epistle to the latter, written when he was a candidate for the consulship a. 690, is full of well-meant but unnecessary advice, dressed up rhetorically in the style of his brother, though not in such elaborate periods; it is usually found in the editions of the letters of M. Cicero (e. g. in Orelli's edition, p. 359—370). It has been separately edited by Valerius Palermus (above 171, 3), C. G. Schwarz (cum animadv. Altorf 1719, Nürnberg 1791), J. Hoffa (cum lect. var., Lips. 1837). J. W. Tijdeman, in Q. Cic. de pet. cons. adnotatt., Lugd. Bat. 1838 sq. 20 hexamaters de XII signis and two distichs against women are attributed to Q. Cicero on very slender authority; see Burmann's Latin Anthology III 88. V 41, Meyer's Anthology I p. 16. See also Orelli's Cicero IV 2 p. 571 sq. = 1053 sq. ed. II.

178. Cicero's freedman and friend, M. Tullius Tiro, long survived his patron and carefully cultivated his memory by describing his life, publishing his orations and letters, and perhaps also collecting his puns. He also wrote works of a comprehensive or grammatical character, and seems to have also dabbled in poetry. His name has become well-known through the notae Tironianae.

1. Cic. ad Fam. XVI 4, 3: innumerabilia tua sunt in me officia: domestica, forensia; urbana, provincialia; in re privata, in publica; in studiis, in litteris nostris. 17, 1: κανὼν esse meorum scriptorum soles. Cf. ad Att. VII 5, 2. Gell. VI (VII) 3, 8: Tiro Tullius, M. Ciceronis libertus, sane quidem fuit ingenio homo eleganti et haudquaquam rerum litterarumque veterum indoctus, eoque ab ineunte aetate liberaliter instituto adminiculatore et quasi administro in studiis litterarum Cicero usus est. ib. XIII 9, 1. XV 16, 2. He was manumitted a. 700 (Cic. ad Fam. XVI 16). A. 704 he was adulescens (ad Att. VI 7 extr.). Hieronym. on Euseb. Chron. ad a. Abr. 2013 = Ol. 194, 1, = c. 750 V. C.: M. Tullius Tiro, Ciceronis libertus, qui primus notas commentus est, in Puteolano praedio (cf. Cic. Fam. XVI 21, 7) usque ad centesimum

annum consenescit. J. C. d'Engelbronner, de M. Tullio Tirone, Amsterdam 1804. 4. A. Lion, Tironiana, in Seebode's Archiv 1824 p. 247 sqq. and ed. alt., Götting. 1846. Drumann, Hist. of Rome VI p. 405—409. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. VI 2 p. 2207 sq.

2. Ascon. in Milon. p. 49 Or.: ut legimus apud Tironem libertum Ciceronis in libro III de vita eius. His work bore the character of an apology. Plutarch who cites it (Cic. 41. 49) has no doubt availed himself of it in part of his *Βίος Κικέρωνος:* see H. Peter, on Plutarch's Sources p. 129—135. Tac. dial. 17. Gell. IV 10, 6.—ib. XV 16, 2: a Tirone . . librorum patroni sui studiosissimo. A ms. of Cic.'s orations revised by him is mentioned ib. I 7, 1 (in oratione Cic. V in Verr., libro spectatae fidei, Tironiana cura atque disciplina facto) and XIII 21, 16 (in uno atque in altero antiquissimae fidei libro Tironiano). Quintil. X 7, 31 (above 167, 4.). In all probability Tiro was also the editor of collections of Cicero's correspondence; see above 170, 3. 171, 4. He was also the reputed author of a collection of ioci Ciceronis. Quintil. VI 3, 5: utinam libertus eius, aut alius quisquis fuit, qui de hac re librum edidit, parcius dictorum numero indulsissent etc. Macrob. II 1, 12: liberti eius libros quos is de iocis patroni composuit. Schol. Bob. in Sest. p. 309 Or.: hoc etiam dictum . . Tullius Tiro . . inter iocos Ciceronis adnumerat.

3. Gell. VI (VII) 3, 10: (Tirò) epistulam conscripsit ad Q. Axium, familiarem patroni sui, confidenter nimis et calide, in qua sibimet visus est orationem (of Cato the Elder) pro Rhodiensibus acri subtilique iudicio percensuisse (no doubt in maiorem gloriam patroni). X 1, 7: quod . . Tiro Tullius . . in epistula quadam enarratius scripsit ad hunc ferme modum. XIII 9, 2 sqq.: (Tullius Tiro) libros complures de usu atque ratione linguae latinae, item de variis atque promiscis quaestionibus composuit. in his esse praecipue videntur quos graeco titulo *Πανδέκτας* inscripsit. ibi de his stellis . . hoc scriptum est. Charis. II p. 186 P. = 207, 30 K.: 'novissime' Tiro in Pandecte non recte ait dici etc. — Cic. Fam. XVI 18, 3 (a. 709): tu (Tiro) nullosne tecum libellos? an pangis aliquid Sophocleum? fac opus appareat.

4. Suetonius (ed. Reifferscheid p. 135 sq.) and from him Isidore Orig. I 21 and a Cassel ms. of the Notae Tironis et Senecae (W. Schmitz, Symb. philol. Bonn p. 532): vulgares notas Ennius primus mille et centum invenit. notarum usus erat ut quidquid pro contione aut in iudiciis diceretur librarii scriberent simul astantes, divisis inter se partibus quot quisque verba et quo ordine exciperet. (Cf. Manil. Astr. IV 197 sqq. Quintil. XI 2, 25. Auson. epigr. 146.) Romae primus Tullius Tiro, Ciceronis libertus, commentatus (perhaps commentus, as it is in Jerome, see note 1) est notas, sed tantum praepositionum. post eum Vipsanius, Philargyrus et Aquila, libertus Maecenatis (also in Dio LV 7; see below 207, 6) alius alias addiderunt. denique Seneca contracto omnium digestoque et aucto numero opus effecit in quinque milia. Ennius who is mentioned here is, in all probability, the grammarian of the Augustan period, who ought to have been mentioned before

the words 'denique Seneca'. Under the title of Notae Tironis (Tyronis) et Senecae we possess an extensive collection of abbreviations of this kind, of various dates and divided into six commentarii, first published by Gruter in his Thesaurus inscriptionum (cf. W. Schmitz, Rh. Mus. XVIII p. 145—148), on which U. F. Kopp (in his Palaeographia critica, Mannheim 1817. 4.) founded a Lexicon Tironianum. A list of the mss. of these notae see in Kopp I § 331—354, and in Zeibig p. 57 sqq. See also Th. Sickel, on the Lexicon Tironianum of the foundation library at Göttweig, Transactions of the Academy at Vienna XXXVIII 1861. On the oldest ms. at Cassel and that at Wolfenbüttel see W. Schmitz, Tironiana, in the Symb. philol. Bonn. p. 531—550. On the whole subject see G. Michaelis, in the Journal of Stenography 1859, no. 1. J. W. Zeibig, on the history and literature of shorthand writing, Dresden 1863.

179. Besides Varro, Hortensius, the two brothers Cicero, and some others, the satirist L. Albucius and the didactic writer Egnatius (de rerum natura) wrote in metre. Quintipor Clodius seems to have been a late imitator of the palliate comedies. Of greater importance were the Roman knight D. Laberius (a. 649—711) who in his mimi combined Greek culture with plebeian coarseness, and M. Furius Bibaculus of Cremona (born 651), the author of poetical libels in the manner of Catullus directed especially against the monarchic faction, of a compilation entitled Lucubrationes, and perhaps also of an epic poem on the Gallic war.

1. Varro R. R. III, 2, 17: L. Albucius, homo, ut scitis, apprime doctus, cuius Luciliano charactere sunt libelli, dicebat etc. cf. ib. 6, 6: Hortensius, . . quem secuti multi, ut quidem Albucius aiebat. Fronto p. 113 sq. Naber: in poetis quis ignorat ut gracilis sit Lucilius, Albucius aridus, sublimis Lucretius . . ?

2. Macrob. Sat. VI 5, 2: Egnatius de rerum natura libro primo (after Accius in Philoctete and before Lucretius in secundo); also ib. 12 after Livius, Ennius, Accius, before Cornificius). One of the hexameters quoted there is remarkable for the fact of final *s* being discarded.

3. Varro in Bimarco: cum Quintipor Clodius tot comoedias sine ulla fecerit Musa etc. Non. p. 448. The expression 'comoediae' renders it probable that they were palliatae. It is, therefore, possible that Varro's words (ap. Non. p. 117) should be read with Al. Riese: Quintiporis Clodi Antipho fies ac poemata eius gargaridians dices: O Fortuna etc. (from Ter. Phorm. 841, where Geta pronounces the line).

4. Sueton. Caes. 39: ludis (a. 709) D. Laberius eques rom. mimum suum egit. cf. Macrob. II 7, 2: Laberium, asperae libertatis (according to the notions of the Imperial period) equitem rom., Caesar . . invitavit ut prodiret in scenam et ipse ageret mimos quos scriptitabat,

where mimum quem scripserat would be a more appropriate expression, Laberius having until then written mimi for the ludi given by the magistrates (see Macrob. II 6, 6) without performing himself, nor does he seem to have performed a second time. Cf. Sen. Controv. VII p. 207 and 414 sq. Bu. Laberius was then sixty years old (v. 109 Ribb.), and appears, therefore, to have been born 648 or 649. Hieron. on Eus. Chr. ad a. Abr. 1974 = Ol. 184, 2 = a. 711: Laberius mimorum scriptor decimo mense post C. Caesaris interitum (i. e. January 711) Puteolis moritur. The impressive prologue to his (compulsory) performance in a. 709 has been preserved by Macrobius II 7, 3 (who took it from Gellius VIII 15). Political allusions see ib. 4 sq. Comp. Gell. XVII 14, 2: C. Caesarem ita Laberii maledicentia et adrogantia (in Caesar's opinion) offendebat ut acceptiores sibi esse Publilii quam Laberii mimos praedicaret. Even in everyday-life, Laberius' tongue would sting; see Sen. l. l. and Macrob. II 3, 10. 6, 6. The 44 titles of his plays which we know and the fragments prove the complete absorption of all the other kinds of comedy in the mimus which now combines the Greek character of the palliatae, the family life and the Roman manners of the togatae, and the coarseness and immorality of the Atellanae. Besides the titles resembling palliatae (see above 8, 3) we meet also many derived from professions, e. g. Augur, Catularius, Centonarius, Colorator, Fullo, Piscator, Restio, Salinator, Staminariae; plots of intrigue seem to be indicated by Aries, Cancer, Carcer, Imago, Nuptiae, Paupertas, Taurus; Aululariа, Caeculi, Galli, Gemelli, Late loquentes, Sorores, Stricturae, Virgo; Cretensis, Tusca; Anna Perenna, Lacus Avernus, Compitalia, Natal, Parilia, Saturnalia. The allusions to Pythagorea dogma, Cynica haeresis, Democritus, are evidence in favour of the high culture of the writers of mimi; but there is also much evidence to show its connexion with the prevailing immorality of the time. Laberius was very bold in forming new words, see e. g. Gell. XVI 7, 1 sq. Tertull de pall. 1. Some peculiarities were plebeian: Gell. XIV 13, 3. Cf. also v. 55 Ribb. the candid confession: versorum, non numerum numero studuimus. The prosody of his senarii is the same as that of the other dramatists and, as a rule, they are fluent; he has also trochees, and in some isolated places bacchiacs. The fragments are found in Bothe scen. p. 205 sqq. and in Ribbeck's com. lat. p. 237—258. On Laberius see especially C. J. Grysar, on the Mimus of the Romans (1854) p. 290—296.

5. Hieronym. in Euseb. Chron. ad a. Abr. 1914 = Ol. 169, 2 = 651 V. C. (in which year Turpilius and Lucilius died): M. Furius poeta cognomento Bibaculus Cremonae nascitur. C. Nipperdey, in Hor. Satt. I comm. altera (Jena 1858. 4.) p. 12—15, assumes that Jerome placed the natal year of Bib. by at least 20 years too early, and this would be acceptable were it supported by anything else but the desire of making his own conception of the poet agree with his period of life. Quintil. X 1, 96: iambus . . cuius acerbitas in Catullo, Bibaculo, Horatio . . reperietur. Diomed III p. 842 P. = 485, 17 K. (s. above 27, 1). Tac. A. IV 34: carmina Bibaculi et Catulli referta contumeliis Caesarum leguntur: sed

ipse divus Iulius, ipse divus Augustus et tulere ista et reliquere. Specimens of the hendecasyllabics of Bib. see in Suet. gramm. 11 and Charis. I p. 127, 12 K.: Bibaculus: duplici toga involutus. An iambic line by him is given by Suet. gramm. 9. See also Anon. de gener. nom. ed. Otto (Giessen 1850. 4.) nr. 38. Ribbeck, Append. Verg. p. 7 sq. believes him to be the author of Vergil. Catal. 5. The hexameter in Schol. Juv. VIII 16 (Bibaculus: Osce senex Catinaeque puer, Cumana meretrix) may have belonged to an epigram. Plin. N. H. praef. 24 speaking of the choice of titles of books says: nostri .. facetissimi Lucubrationum (inscripserunt), puto quia Bibaculus erat et vocabatur. Hence in all probability Macrob. S. II 1, 13: is iocus (of Cicero) . . mihi ex libro Fusii Vivaculi notus est. To this work should be referred the notice Messala Corvinus in quadam epistola .. non esse sibi dicit rem cum Furio Bibaculo, ne cum Ticida quidem aut litteratore Catone (Suet. gramm. 4). For the references to decide whether in Pliny we should read Bibaculus or Vivaculus, see Teuffel on Horace's Sat. II 5, 40. p. 135. The fact of Bibaculus' long life is proved by Suet. gramm. 9: Orbilius (born 642) vixit prope ad centesimum aetatis annum, amissa iam pridem memoria, ut versus Bibaculi docet: Orbilius ubinam est, litterarum oblivio? If the expression iam pridem may be understood as denoting even the space of 15 years (though this appears incredible in the common course of nature), Bibaculus might have written the poem in question about 725. It would not, therefore, be impossible to apply the words of Horace (Sat. II 5, 40 sq., a. 724): seu pingui tentus omaso Furius hibernas cana nive conspuet Alpes, to Bibaculus. See Porphyrio's note on the passage: hic versus Furii Vivaculi est. ille enim, cum vellet Alpes nivibus plenas describere, ait: Iuppiter hibernas cana nive conspuit Alpes, a line also quoted by Quintil. VIII 6, 17 as an instance of a forced metaphor. Acro ad l. is more detailed: Furius Vivaculus in pragmatia belli gallici: Iuppiter etc. If this be true, Bibaculus appears at first to have been an admirer of Caesar and to have become his enemy on discovering his monarchical designs. This assumption is just as probable as to assume that the same writer was first turgid, and subsequently caustic in quite a different department. It is more doubtful whether we may apply to Bibaculus Hor. S. I 10, 36 sq.: turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona, dumque defingit Rheni luteum caput, where Acro says: Bibaculum quendam poetam gallum tangit, so that he would seem to have written an Aethiopis, but Porphyrio says: Cornelius Alpinus hexametris nimirum descripsit. At all events, the lines quoted by Gell. XVIII 11 cannot be by Bibaculus; see above 123, 4. Kirchner's conjecture (Comm. on Hor. S. I. 1855. p. 329) that the first 8 lines of Hor. S. I 10 might be by Bibaculus is not very probable. A. Weichert, de M. Furio Bibaculo poeta, in his poett. latt. vitae p. 331—364, gives an uncritical collection of materials. The other extreme is represented by C. Nipperdey l. l. who is of opinion that Horace could scarcely have ventured to sneer at so celebrated a poet as Bibaculus, but aims at an obscure Furius Alpinus. See A. Wissowa, on the passage in Hor. Sat. II 5 concerning the poet Furius. Breslau 1867. 4.

THE SECOND HALF OF THE CICERONIAN PERIOD, comprising the years 691—711.

180. In the course of these years Caesar became very prominent. But within this period we may again notice two distinct generations. The elder generation produced the historians Caesar, Cornelius Nepos, Caesar's continuator Hirtius, and Oppius; the scholars and professors Nigidius, Valerius Cato, Orbilius; the Stoic Cato; the jurists Ofilius and Trebatius; the orators Calidius and Memmius; the poets Lucretius and Trebonius.

1. Maecius Tarpa seems to belong to the same generation; being mentioned as a critic as far back as 699 (Cic. ad Fam. VII 1, 1: nobis erant ea perpetienda quae Sp. Maecius probavisset), though we do not know whether he ever wrote anything. It is doubtful whether we are at liberty to identify him with the Metius mentioned in Donatus' 'additamentum' to Suetonius' vita Ter.: duos Terentios poetas fuisse scribit Metius. He subsequently held an official position at the recitations in the collegium poetarum (Hor. S. I 10, 46 and the transactions of the philological congress at Heidelberg, p. 163—166), and for this reason he is typically mentioned by Horace (Ep. II 3, 387) as the critic.

181. C. Julius C. f. C. n. Caesar was born on July 12, 654 (100), his father having died after his praetorship, his mother being the excellent Aurelia. As he was related to Marius, his life was in danger when Sulla was victorious; a. 674 sqq. he served in Asia, and commenced his oratorical and political career with charges of extortions against members of the nobility; he then continued his studies at Rhodes a. 679, became Quaestor (687) in Hispania ulterior, aedile 689, pontifex maximus 691, was praetor 692, propraetor in Hispania ulterior 693 sq., Consul 695 (59), having previously concluded, a. 694, the first triumvirate with Pompey and Crassus, and having throughout followed the plan of presenting himself as the man of the people. In the years 696—704, Caesar was proconsul in Gaul, which country he subjugated and re-arranged, but at the same time he opened up numerous resources to himself and trained a practised and faithful army. By means of this he gained absolute power in the years

705—708, (Cos. II 707, III 708), a fact openly acknowledged by his being Consul sine collega (IV 709, V 710) and dictator reip. constituendae. In 710, March 15, he succumbed to the strokes of his murderers.

1. Our sources for Caesar's life are, besides his own Commentarii, *chief*ly Suetonius' D. Iulius, then Plutarch's *βίος Καίσαρος*, which seems to follow the same authorities as Appianus' *Ἐμφύλια*, i. e. probably Asinius Pollio and Livy; see H. Peter, Plutarch's sources (1865) p. 119—129.

2. For complete biographies of Caesar see W. Drumann Hist. of Rome III (1837) p. 129—762; P. van Limburg-Brouwer, Cesar en zijne tydgenooten, 3 parts, Gröningen 1844—1846. Mommsen Hist. of Rome III. Köchly and Rüstow, Introd. to Caes.'s Comm. on the Gallic war (1857) p: 9—50 (until 703). C. Peter, Hist. of Rome II p. 209 sqq. Merivale's History of the Romans under the Empire, vol. I. Napoléon III, Histoire de Jules César, 2 vols., Paris 1865 and 1866.

3. The traditional date of Caesar's birth-year has been defended, against Mommsen III² p. 15 sq. who assumed 652, by C. Nipperdey, in the Transactions of the Saxon Society of Sciences 1865, V p. 3 sqq., by proving the received notions on the leges annales to be erroneous.

182. Caesar possessed the most varied talents: a great politician and a great general, his clear mind and the iron energy of his will qualified him to be the ruler of a time not able to rule itself. This task he conceived at an early time and pursued it with the whole energy of his mind, with cunning and boldness, with quiet perseverance and farsighted calculation. But the very qualities which made him the ruler of Rome, were not calculated to make him a brilliant writer. Handling his language, as he did, with complete mastery both in speaking and writing, he still used it only as a means of attaining definite political aims, and both his subjects and his style were influenced by the aims and the unimaginative cast of his mind. For this reason, he himself thought little of his own eloquence, though in his time he was surpassed only by Cicero, being remarkable for precision, good taste and vivacity of style and delivery; if possible, he thought even less of his verses, though his metrical compositions were not confined to his youth. His precise thinking is attested by his treatises on grammatical correctness — while his jovial disposition appears from his collection of witticisms. His astronomical work (de astris) probably arose from his rectification of the calendar. There is

not the slightest doubt as to the political purpose of his works against Cato (who had been praised as a martyr of the Republic) and of his Commentarii.

1. On Caesar as an orator see Cic. Brut. 72, 252: de Caesare . . ita iudico, . . illum omnium fere oratorum latine loqui elegantissime (see below note 4), nec id solum domestica consuetudine . . sed . . multis litteris, et eis quidem reconditis et exquisitis, summoque studio et diligentia est consecutus. 75, 261: splendidam quandam minumeque veteratoriam rationem dicendi tenet, voce, motu, forma etiam magnifica et generosa quodammodo. Fronto Epist. p. 123 Nab.: Caesari facultatem dicendi video imperatoriam fuisse. Quintil. X 1, 114: C. Caesar si foro tantum vacasset, non alius ex nostris contra Ciceronem nominaretur. tanta in eo vis est, id acumen, ea concitatio ut illum eodem animo dixisse quo bellavit appareat; exornat tamen haec omnia mira sermonis, cuius proprie studiosus fuit, elegantia. Tac. A. XIII 3: dictator Caesar summis oratoribus aemulus. Suet. Caes. 55: post accusationem Dolabellae (a. 677; there is an error in the mss. of Tac. dial. 34) haud dubie principibus patronis annumeratus est. See also Quintil. XII 10 11 (above 36, 9). Vellei. II 36. Tac. dial. 21 (note 2). Apulei. apol. 95. Plut. Caes. 3. On Caesar's style Hirtius, B. G. VIII praef. 7, says: erat in Caesare facultas atque elegantia summa scribendi.

2. Caesar's speeches. Cic. Brut. 75, 262: orationes eius mihi vehementer probantur, compluris autem leg. Tac. dial. 21: concedamus C. Caesari ut propter magnitudinem cogitationum et occupationes rerum minus in eloquentia effecerit quam divinum eius ingenium postulabat . . nisi forte quisquam Caesaris pro Decio Samnite . . ceterosque eiusdem lentitudinis ac teporis libros legit. Gell. IV 16, 8: C. Caesar, gravis auctor linguae latinae, . . in Dolabellam actionis I lib. I (the mss.: actionis III: ibi). V 13, 6: in oratione quam pro Bithynis (a. 677: see Rhein. Mus. XIX p. 577—581) dixit hoc principio usus est (cf. Jul. Ruf. 8, p. 40, 24 Halm). XIII 3, 5: repperi in oratione C. Caesaris qua Plautiam rogationem suasit (a. 684?). cf. Non. p. 354. Schol. Bob. p. 297 Or.: Caesaris orationes contra hos (Memmius and Domitius, a. 696) extant, quibus et sua acta defendit et illos insectatur. ib. p. 317: ibi (in the senate) habitae sunt tres illae orationes contra Domitium et Memmium. Suet. Caes. 6: in amitae laudatione (a. 686) . . sic refert. 55: orationes aliquas reliquit, inter quas temere quaedam feruntur, e. g. that pro Metello (above 36, 7) and apud milites in Hispania. The fragments of Caesar's speeches and the authorities concerning them are collected in Meyer's oratt. rom.[2] p. 408—420 and in Nipperdey's edition of Caesar, 1847, p. 749—751.

3. Caesar's poems. Tac. dial. 21: nisi qui et carmina eorundem (of Caesar and M. Brutus) miratur. fecerunt enim et carmina et in bybliothecas rettulerunt, non melius quam Cicero, sed felicius, quia istos fecisse pauciores sciunt. Suet. Caes. 56: feruntur et a puero et ab (ut ait Varro, ab Bentley) adulescentulo quaedam scripta, ut Laudes Herculis.

tragoedia Oedipus, item Dicta collectanea. quos omnis libellos vetuit Augustus publicari. Ib.: reliquit et . . poema quod inscribitur Iter, (quod fecit) . . dum ab urbe in Hispaniam ulteriorem quarto et vicesimo die pervenit (a. 708). Six hexameters on Terence are quoted by Suet. v. Terent. 5. Plin. N. H. XIX 8, 144: olus . . D. Iulii carminibus . . celebratum. Plin. Ep. V 3, 5 (above 26, 1) justifies the inference that Caesar also wrote erotic poems, cf. also Plut. Caes. 2: *ποιήματα γραφών*.

4. Sueton. Caes. 56: reliquit et de analogia duos libros, . . (quos) in transitu Alpium, cum ex citeriore Gallia conventibus peractis ad exercitum rediret, . . fecit (a. 699?). Fronto Ep. p. 221 Naber: . . C. Caesarem . . duos de analogia libros scrupulosissimos scripsisse, . . de nominibus declinandis, de verborum aspirationibus et rationibus. Cic. Brut. 72, 253: qui etiam in maxumis occupationibus ad te (Cic.) . . de ratione latine loquendi accuratissime scripserit. Gell. XIX 8, 3: C. Caesar, . . vir ingenii praecellentis, sermonis praeter alios suae aetatis castissimi, in libros quos ad M. Ciceronem de analogia conscripsit. The rule quoted ib. I 10, 4, ut tanquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum, is quite in accordance with Caesar's character. The fragments of this treatise have been collected by Nipperdey (Caes. 1847) p. 753—757. See also Lersch, On the Linguistic Philosophy of the Ancients I p. 129 sqq. Fr. Schlitte, de C. Iulio Caesare grammatico, Halle 1865, where the fragments are found p. 13—36.

5. Cic. ad Fam. IX 16, 4 (a. 708): audio Caesarem, cum volumina iam confecerit *Ἀποφθεγμάτων*, si quod afferatur ad eum pro meo quod meum non sit reicere solere. Suet. Caes. 56 (above a. 3) mentions Dicta collectanea.

6. De astris. Macrob. I 16, 39: Iulius Caesar siderum motus, de quibus non indoctos libros reliquit, ab aegyptiis disciplinis hausit. Plin. N. H. in the Index of his authors for book I, and in book XVIII among the Latin authors: ex . . L. Tarutio, qui graece de astris scripsit, Caesare dictatore, qui item. He actually mentions him repeatedly in b. XVIII, and he is also referred to by Ptolemy and Lydus: see Nipperdey (1847) p. 757—162. Pliny's words leave it doubtful whether the work was in Greek or Latin, and Suetonius' silence on this work would also seem to lead to the conclusion that it was not really written by Caesar himself, but merely compiled at his order and edited by some one else, perhaps a Greek. The work on auguries was by L. Caesar, see below 186, 12.

7. Suet. Caes. 56: reliquit et de analogia duos libros et Anticatones totidem . . (quos) sub tempus Mundensis proelii (17 March 709) fecit. Juv. VI 338: duo Caesaris Anticatones. This treatise was against Cicero's panegyric on Cato (above 167, 6), but with much flattery towards Cicero (Plut. Caes. 3. Cic. 39. Plin. N. H. VII 30, 117), and bitter animosity against Cato who, in order to deprive the republican party of their hero, was ridiculed and maligned (Plut. Caes. 54. Cato min. 36. 52. 54). Cicero expressed himself to Caesar on this work with much

favour (ad Att. XIII 50, 1. 51, 1), though he changed after Caesar's death (Top. 25, 94). See H. Wartmann, Cato's life (1858) p. 161—175.

8. It is natural that a man like Caesar should have had a large correspondence, and there were indeed several collections of his letters made and published after his death, many of them in cypher, the key to which is given by Suetonius (Caes. 56, cf. Gell. XVII 9, 3 sq.) Suet. l. l.: epistulae quoque eius ad senatum exstant. . . exstant et ad Ciceronem, item ad familiares domesticis de rebus etc. Gell. XVII 9, 1: libri sunt epistularum C. Caesaris ad C. Oppium et Balbum Cornelium, qui rebus eius absentis curabant. The various references to Caesar's correspondence with these and many others are collected in Nipperdey's edition of Caesar, 1847, p. 766—783. Letters of Caesar to Cicero and others are found in Cic. ad Att. IX 6, A. 7. C. 13 A 16. X 8 B.

9. F. W. Otto, Gleaning of fragments of Caesar, Ztschr. f. AW. 1850, nr. 39 sq., and M. Hertz, Philol. V p. 754 sqq.

183. Of Caesar's literary works only the most important has come down to us, his Memoirs (commentarii), containing the history of the first seven years of the Gallic war in seven books, and the history of the Civil war down to the Alexandrine war in three books, and lying midway between a mere collection of materials or the rapid and sketchy remarks of a diary and a carefully elaborated historical work. But artless and unpretentious as the form is, the contents are carefully meditated. Without any flagrant violation of truth, the author knows thoroughly how to interpret the facts in his favour or, if more convenient, to pass them over in silence; without ever boasting or sacrificing the semblance of an objective 'historia', he perfectly succeeds in displaying his personal merits to the greatest possible advantage, in justifying his actions and clearing his motives. The books on the Gallic war were published on its termination, a. 703; those on the Civil war do not seem to have been finished.

1. Suet. Caes. 56 in.: reliquit et rerum suarum commentarios gallici civilisque belli pompeiani. Cic. Brut. 75, 262: etiam commentarios quosdam scripsit rerum suarum valde quidem probandos, nudi enim sunt, recti et venusti, omni ornatu orationis tamquam veste detracta. Hirtius b. g. VIII praef.: Caesaris nostri commentarios rerum gestarum Galliae . . contexui etc. constat inter omnes, nihil tam operose ab aliis esse perfectum quod non horum elegantia commentariorum superetur. qui sunt editi . . adeo probantur . . ut praerepta, non praebita facultas scriptoribus videatur. . . ceteri quam bene atque emendate, nos etiam quam facile atque celeriter eos perfecerit scimus. Sueton. Caes. 56: Pollio

Asinius parum diligenter parumque integra veritate compositos putat, cum Caesar pleraque et quae per alios erant gesta temere crediderit et quae per se vel consulto vel etiam memoria lapsus perperam ediderit, existimatque rescripturum et correcturum fuisse. The latter may perhaps be admitted of the bell. civ.; see Köchly-Rüstow, Introduction to the Gallic war, p. 93. Various misrepresentations of facts are pointed out by Drumann III p. 756 sq. The opinion that the work was looked upon as a one-sided party-pamphlet, may have contributed to the scanty use made of it. Strabo IV p. 177 calls it ὑπομνήματα, Plut. Caes. 22 (and Symmach. Epist. IV 18) ἐφημερίδες (comp. Appian. Celt. 18: ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀναγραφαῖς τῶν ἰδίων ἔργων), just as Sidon. Ap. IX 14 mistakenly styles the eighth book ou the Gallic war Balbi ephemeris. He (Ep. IX 14) and Orosius (VI 7) know the work only from its title and misinterpret libri C. Caesaris de bello gallico as meaning a work on Caesar's Gallic war, for the author of which they take Caesar's biographer, Suetonius. Nipperdey (1847) p. 36.

2. The mss. of the Commentarii are divided into two classes, the one being the older and better (saec. IX sqq.) and containing only the eight books de bello gallico, the other later (saec. XI sqq.) and of inferior quality containing the complete works. To the first belong especially Bongars. I, Paris. I, Voss. I, Vat.: to the second Paris. II, Leid. I and Med. The end of book VIII of the Bell. Gall. and of B. Hispan. is not contained in any mss., and the bell. civ. contains gaps in several places. On the ms. of both these classes see Nipperdey's edition of 1847, p. 37—50. H. J. Heller, Philol. XVII p. 492—509; on those of the first A. Frigell in the Nordisk Univ. Tidskr. (Upsala 1857) III p. 50—58. D. Detlefsen, Philologus XVII p. 649—660. Whitte, coll. codd. II mss. Havn. Caes. de b. g., Copenhagen 1847.

3. Editions of the commentarii, including the continuations. Ed. princeps, Rom. 1469. fol. Iensoniana, Ven. 1471. fol. Cura Ph. Beroaldi (Bonon. 1504. fol.), Io. Iucundi (Ald. 1513. 1519), Florentina 1508. Ed. F. Ursinus (Antv. 1570), I. Lipsius Antv. 1585), Ios. Scaliger (Lugd. Bat. 1606). Compilation (with the notes of Glareanus, Manutius and others) by G. Jungermann (Frankfort 1604. 4.). Ex rec. Io. Davisii, Cantabr. 1706. 1727. 4. Cum annotatt. Sam. Clarkii, London 1712. fol. Cum not. var. ed. I. G. Graevius, Lugd. Bat. 1713. 2 voll. Ebenso cura Fr. Oudendorpii, Lugd. Bat. 1713. 4. (Stuttgart 1822. 8. 2 voll.). Ed. S. F. N. Morus, Lips. 1780 (cur. I. I. Oberlin, Lips. 1805. 1819).

Critical editions: Rec., optimorum codd. auct. ann., quaestiones criticas (251 pp.) praemisit C. Nipperdey, Lips. 1847. Annot. crit. instruxit Fr. Dübner, Paris 1867. 2 voll.

Texts by C. Nipperdey (Lips. 1847. 1856), E. Hoffmann (Vindob. 1856 sq.), Fr. Kraner (Lips., Tauchn., 1861), B. Dinter (Lips., Teubner, 1864), Fr. Dübner (Paris 1866).

There are translations in all languages. A Greek translation was made in the 16th century from the edition of R. Stephen (Paris 1544),

most probably at Paris by a Frenchman; it was first edited by Jungermann a. 1606: see H. J. Heller, Philologus XII p. 107—149.

4. On Caesar's literary labours in general see C. E. Schneider, on Caesar's character as far as it may be traced in his writings, in Wachler's Philomathia I p. 180 sqq. D. Henne, de Caes. rerum a se gestarum scriptore, Paris 1843.

Napoleon (I), précis des guerres de César, Paris 1835. W. Rüstow, on Caesar's army and tactics, Gotha 1855. Nordhausen 1862. A. v. Cohausen, on Caesar's bridges over the Rhine, a philological and military disquisition, Leipzig 1867.

On the authenticity of Caesar's Commentarii see Bresemer (Berlin 1835. 4.), F. Winkelmann (Jahn's Archiv II p. 533—550), F. Eyssenhardt (Jahn's Jahrbb. LXXXV p. 755—764), F. Seck (de .. fide, Essen 1860 and 1864. 4.).

Fr. H. Th. Fischer, Grammatical Observations on Caesar, Halle 1853. 1854. 4. C. Kossak, de ablat. absol. usu ap. Caes., Gumbinnen 1858. 4. Reinhardt, on the tempora and modi in Caesar, Heilbronn 1859. 4.

Critical remarks by Fr. Kindscher (Zerbst 1860. 1864. 4,) Beck. (Lauenburg 1863. 4.) and others.

5. On the date of the publication of the books on the Gallic war see C. E. Schneider in Wachler's Philomathia I p. 184 sqq., Mommsen's Roman History III² p. 594 note, Köchly and Rüstow, Introd. to the Gallic war p. 51, n. 28. That publication was intended to calm imminent tempests and impress the popular mind with an idea of Caesar's fitness for great emergencies. As Caesar had carried on his expeditions without special command of the Senate, he constantly endeavours to represent them as necessary measures of defence. His memoirs embrace only the events of war, which he relates as a Roman would do to Romans, without sentimentality and without disguising the cruelty and perfidiousness employed against tribes defending their right and independence. We perceive a certain pride on the part of the writer in describing the exploits of his faithful partisans. He carefully abstains from injuring the popular tendency of his work by going too much into military details. The style is concise without being poor, lively and cearl, simple without monotony, and attractive even when careless. A short abstract is given by Köchly and Rüstow, l. l. p. 51—85, and a criticism ibid. p. 85—94.

6. Editions of the Bellum Gallicum with notes (and sometimes maps), by C. G. Elberling (Havn. 1827), J. C. Held (Sulzbach 1825 sqq. 1832), C. G. Herzog (Leipzig 1825. 1831), J. Apitz (Berlin 1835), C. E. C. Schneider (rec. et ill., Halle 1840—1855. 2 voll.; only B. I—VII), M. Seyffert (2. ed. Halle 1851), Eichert (Breslau 1859 sq.), Stüber and Reinhard (Stuttgart 1860), A. Frigell (rec., codd. contulit, comm. instr., Upsala 1861, 3 parts), F. W. Hinzpeter (8. ed. Bielefeld 1868), Fr. Kraner (1853; 6. ed. by Dittenberger, Berlin, Weidmann), A. Doberenz (4. ed. Leipzig, Teubner, 1867), J. Quosseck (Cologne 1866) and others.

For explanation see H. Köchly and W. Rüstow's Introduction to Caesar's Commentaries on the Gallic war, Gotha 1857.

C. W. Glück, on the Celtic names in Caesar, Munich 1857. H. J. Heller, de nominibus celticis in Caes. comm. traditis, Philologus XVII p. 270—287.

J. Reichard, on the geography of the events in the Gallic war, Leipzig 1832. A Geography of transalpine Gaul, by F. A. M. Friedler (Essen 1828) and J. v. Hefner (Munich 1836). M. A. Fischer, on Gergovia, Leipzig 1856. A. v. Göler, on Caesar's Gallic war in the years 58—53 B. C.

Since Napoleon III has devoted his studies to this subject, we have received numerous contributions from France towards the military and geographical explanation of the subject. Among them we will mention F. de Saulcy, les campagnes de Jules César dans les Gaules. Études d'archéologie militaire. I. Paris 1862. L. Fallue, Conquête des Gaules, Paris 1862. Creuly, carte de la Gaule sous le proconsulat de César, Paris 1864. These and other works are enumerated and criticized by H. J. Heller, Philologus XIX p. 465—576. XXII p. 89—174. 285—330. XXVI p. 652—700.

A. Platen, de fide et auctoritate Caes. de bell. gall. comm., Liegniz, 1854. 4.

7. The three books of the Bellum Civile are evidently less carefully elaborated and contain many undoubted traces of negligence and inaccuracy. The text is in a most deplorable condition. On the subject see Fr. Hofmann, de origine b. c. Caesariani, Berlin 1857, and Th. Mommsen, the question of legal right between Caesar and the Senate, Trans. of the philol. and historical Society at Breslau, I (1857) p. 1—58. A. v. Göler, the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, a. 50—49 B. C., Heidelberg 1861; the battles of Dyrrhachium and Pharsalus, Carlsruhe 1854; the fight at Ruspina, Carlsruhe 1855. Möhring, Quaest. Caesarianae, Creuznach 1858. 4.

J. v. Hefner, on the geography of Caesar's B. C., Munich 1836.

Its authenticity has been questioned in a program of Culmbach, 1864. 4., and by Heidtmann, Essen 1867. 4.

Critical observations by Elberling (obss. cr., Havn. 1828, and varr. lectt. Roeskild 1853), Whitte (collatio codd., Havn. 1847), J. N. G. Forchhammer (de vera . . emendandi ratione, Havn. 1852), Hartz (Adnotatt., Züllichau 1864), L. Vielhaber (Wien 1864. 4.) and others.

184. After Caesar's death his nearest friends thought it incumbent upon them to decribe also those expeditions which he had not narrated himself, being his last year in Gaul, and the Alexandrine, African and Spanish wars. It is evident that they are by three writers. The history of the Spanish war betrays an utter want of style, that of the African war being

superior to it in that respect; but while the first is awkward and uncouth, the second is written in a distorted and inflated style. The account of the eighth year in Gaul and of the Alexandrine war shows an educated writer who endeavours to imitate Caesar's style, and these two works are no doubt by A. Hirtius. Neither the African nor the Spanish war can be by C. Oppius, but must be by a person who had taken part in the war, though perhaps only in an inferior position, and whom Hirtius had asked to write down his reminiscences of it — perhaps that he himself might some day use them for his own work.

1. Suet. Caes. 56: Alexandrini Africique et Hispaniensis (belli) incertus auctor est. alii Oppium putant, alii Hirtium, qui etiam Gallici belli novissimum imperfectumque librum suppleverit. See the praefatio to B. G. VIII: coactus adsiduis tuis vocibus, Balbe, . . rem difficillimam suscepi. Caesaris nostri commentarios rerum gestarum Galliae non cohaerentibus superioribus atque insequentibus eius scriptis contexui, novissimumque imperfectum ab rebus gestis Alexandriae confeci usque ad exitum non quidem civilis dissensionis, cuius finem nullum videmus, sed vitae Caesaris. . . mihi ne illud quidem accidit ut Alexandrino atque Africano bello interessem. quae bella . . ex parte nobis Caesaris sermone sunt nota. Hence it appears that this continuation was written after Caesar's death, at a time when a war with M. Antony had become probable and it was indeed impossible to foresee any end of war; it is also clear that it was written by an intimate friend of Caesar, but not by Cornelius Balbus, whence we are left to choose between C. Oppius and A. Hirtius. The latter is mentioned as the author of the eighth book by Suetonius (Caes. 56: Hirtius ita praedicat). But as Hirtius fell on April 27, 711, and as the account of the Bellum Africanum bears apparently quite a different character from the eighth book and the Bell. Alex. (see n. 3), though the author of the eighth book in his preface states it as his intention to relate also the Bell. Afric., Nipperdey's combination appears highly probable that Hirtius is also the author of the bell. alex., but was prevented from writing a Bell. Afric. and Hispan. by his early death: after which the notes made on these wars for his use by subaltern officers were published just as they were found among his papers. See Drumann III p. 76. C. Nipperdey, de supplementis commentariorum Caesaris, Berlin 1846 = ed. Caes. 1847, p. 8—34. Köchly-Rüstow, Introd. to the Gallic war, p. 105—110.

2. Both Hirtius and Oppius possessed the education necessary for attempting historical composition. Hirtius was caused by Caesar, a. 709, while in Spain, to write an answer to Cicero's panegyric on Cato, in the form of a letter to Cicero, full of flattery to him (Cic. ad Att. XII 40, 1. 41, 4. 44, 1. 45, 4. 47, 3). A short letter from Hirtius to Cicero is found in Cic. ad Att. XV 6. But Oppius also was a writer. Above

all, he wrote a life of Caesar quoted by Plut. Pompei. 10. (*Ὀππίῳ μὲν, ὅταν περὶ Καίσαρος πολεμίων ἢ φίλων διαλέγηται, σφόδρα δεῖ πιστεύειν μετ' εὐλαβείας*) and 17, as well as by Suet. Caes. 53 (circa victum C. Oppius adeo indifferentem docet ut etc.). Hence may be derived the quotation in Plin. N. H. XI 45, 104 (C. Marium . . Oppius auctor est) concerning Marius' severity to himself. Cf. Suet. Caes. 52: C. Oppius . . librum edidit, non esse Caesaris filium quem Cleopatra dicat. Also Charis. I p. 119 P. = 147, 3 K.: Oppius De vita Cassii, idem De vita prioris Africani. It may be supposed that the work named in the first place was, directly or indirectly, against the assassin of Caesar, C. Cassius, while the latter contained a comparison between Caesar and Africanus the Elder, which would most likely be in Caesar's favour. But even L. Cornelius Balbus of Gades, to whom the eighth book of the Gallic war is dedicated, seems to have written on Caesar: see Suet. Caes. 81: cuius rei (omens of Caesar's death) . . auctor est Cornelius Balbus, familiarissimus Caesaris, an expression which scarcely allows us to think of Balbus minor (below 190, 4). Letters of Balbus maior to Cicero of the year 705, in Cic. ad Att. VIII 15 A. IX 7 B. 13 A.; one written conjointly with Oppius ibid. IX 7 A.

3. The eighth book of the Bell. Gall. bears at its end in the Par. II the name A. Hirtii, as well as in Bongars. I and Scaligeranus. Its arrangement is good, the language excellent, though the style lacks Caesar's vigour and is rather languid, lifeless and monotonous (Nipperdey 1847, p. 13). This appears especially in the periods (in which cum is used with immoderate frequency) and in his arrangement of words. The Bellum Alexandrinum shows greater command of style and, perhaps owing to the increased interest of the subject, a more lively colouring, but its pecularities of diction bear such a striking resemblance to B. G. VIII that it is impossible to doubt the identity of authorship (Nipperdey p. 14 sq.). In the Bellum Africanum the whole account is loose and merely chronological; the political views of the author are childish and his loyalty rather awkwardly displayed; the diction is careless and sometimes vulgar (e. g. in the use of the plupf.); the writer attempts to be grandiloquent without success, his command of words being limited (he is fond of using interim), he employs expressions and constructions (e. g. the descriptive inf.) foreign to Hirtius (Nipperdey p. 15—24). The Bellum Hisp. is likewise the work of an unpractised writer whose diction is even more vulgar (he misuses the subjunctive and has such phrases as bene multi etc.) and ungrammatical. Of periods and style he knows nothing: and his want of education is strongly contrasted by his numerous citations (especially from Ennius): see Nipperdey p. 24—30. The corrupt text of the original work may be due to the slovenly character of the original composition. The writer took himself part in the war, and cannot therefore be Oppius or Balbus who were then at Rome. The whole composition bears too low a character for Oppius and is most probably by a subaltern officer whose reminiscences Hirtius intended to use for a subsequent relation. See Nipperdey p. 33 sq.

4. C. E. C. Schneider, nova comment. de bello hisp. recensio, and de indagando belli hisp. scriptore, Breslau 1837. 4.

185. Cornelius Nepos was born in Upper Italy and a friend of both Cicero and Atticus, and also of his younger countryman Catullus. His life may be said to fall between 660 and 730. Besides erotic poems, three books of Chronica were his earliest work, but he seems also to have written a geographical work. His other writings show that he was influenced by Varro, for they were directed to the history of manners and customs and had a biographical and moral tendency. In this way he wrote five books of Exempla, and the elaborate biographies of Cato the Elder and Cicero, and especially his last and most comprehensive work de viris illustribus, in at least 16 books, in which the lives of Romans and foreigners were placed in parallel juxtaposition. The parts we possess of it, the work de excellentibus ducibus exterarum gentium and the biographies of Atticus (being an extract from his work de historicis latinis), show neither historical criticism nor perfection of style, but in the absence of better sources they are often valuable and deserve praise for their lucidity of arrangement and an unpretentious tone.

1. His praenomen is unknown. For his home see Plin. N. H. III 18, 127: Nepos, Padi accola. Plin. Ep. IV 28, 1 to Vibius Severus: Herennius Severus . . magni aestimat in bybliothèca sua ponère imagines municipum tuorum, Cornelii Nepotis et T. Catii (the Insubrian, see above 160, 3). As the only one of the four Insubrian towns (Ptol. III 1, 33) on the Po is Ticinum, it is possible that this should be considered the birthplace of C. N. (Hermes III 62, n. 1). Ostigia (Hostilia) near Mantua, which besides other places claims the honour of being his birthplace, erected a statue to him on May 2, 1868. For his life see Hieronym. ad Pammach. 12, II p. 419 Vall.: refert . . Cornelius Nepos se praesente . . eam pro Cornelio . . defensionem peroratam (a. 689, see above 167, 1). Plin. N. H. IX 39, 137: Nepos Cornelius, qui divi Augusti principatu obiit, me, inquit, iuvene violacea purpura vigebat . . nec multo post rubra Tarentina. huic successit dibapha Tyria. . . hac P. Lentulus Spinther aedilis curulis (a. 691) primus in praetexta usus improbabatur. Cf. ib. XXXVI 7, 59. A. 710 he lost a young son (Cic. ad Att. XVI 14, 4). This as well as the great admiration with which he looks up to Atticus (born 645) renders it probable that Nepos was born about 660 rather than 650 (which is the opinion of Mommsen and others). Corn. XXV 19, 1 (quoniam fortuna nos superstites ei esse voluit) does not prove his supposed equality of age with Atticus. We do not know why

Jerome on Euseb. Chron. does not mention him until a. Abr. 1977 = Ol. 185, 1 = 714 V. C.: Cornelius Nepos scriptor historicus clarus habetur. He survived Catullus (Att. 12, 4) and Atticus († 722; Att. 19, 1), but we do not know how long he lived after writing his addition to the life of Atticus (see n. 4 in fin.).

2. For his relations to Atticus, Cicero and Catullus see Att. 13, 7: saepe propter familiaritatem domesticis rebus interfuimus. Atticus living 668—689 in Athens, their familiaritas cannot have commenced before 690. — Gell. XV 28, 1 exaggerates: Cornelius Nepos . . M. Ciceronis ut qui maxime amicus familiaris fuit. For Cicero's correspondence with Nepos see above 170, 3. A fragment in Suet. Caes. 55; from a letter of Nepos to Cic. in Lactant. Inst. III 15, 10 (above 40, 2). See also Cic. ad Att. XVI 5, 5. 14, 4. Catullus was perhaps recommended to his compatriot on coming to Rome and was patronised and even mentioned in his Chronica by him: see Catull. 1, 3 sqq.

3. Lost writings. 1) Erotic poems. Plin. Ep. V 3, 6: inter quos vel praecipue numerandus est P. Virgilius, Cornelius Nepos . . non quidem hi senatores, sed sanctitas morum non distat ordinibus. — 2) Chronica. Catull. 1, 5 sqq.: iam tum cum ausus es unus Italorum Omne aevum tribus explicare chartis, Doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis. Auson. Epist. 16: apologos Titiani et Nepotis chronica, quasi alios apologos (nam et ipsa instar sunt fabularum) . . misi. Treating of Saturnus as a human being shows the naiveté of Euhemerism. It seems to have been a chronological abridgment in the style of Atticus and Varro, perhaps with stricter limitation to Roman dates The citations from it may be seen in C. L. Roth's edition p. 178 sq. [Halm p. 119—120.] — 3) Exempla. Gell. VI 18, 11: Cornelius Nepos in libro Exemplorum quinto . . litteris mandavit. The quotations from it (Roth p. 179 sq. [Halm p. 120 sq.]) seem to prove that the author had contrasted the simple manners of old Rome with the degeneracy of his own time. Mamurra († 709?) was mentioned in the work, and perhaps Suet. Aug. 77 may be traced back to it: non amplius ter bibere eum solitum super cenam in castris apud Mutinam Cornelius Nepos tradit. — 4) Biography of Cato. Corn. Nep. Cat. 3, 5: huius de vita et moribus plura in eo libro persecuti sumus quem separatim de eo fecimus rogatu T. Pomponii Attici. — 5) Life of Cicero (in several books), probably written after his death. Gell. XV 28, 2: Cornelius Nepos . . in librorum primo quos de vita illius (Cic.) composuit errasse videtur. — 6) A work on Geography, as it would seem, in the manner of the Paradoxographi, without critical sifting of the information, though containing the distances. Plin. N. H. V 1, 4: minus profecto mirentur portentosa Graeciae mendacia . . qui cogitent nostros nuper, quc paulo minus monstrifica quaedam . . tradidisse, . . quaeque alia Cornelius Nepos avidissime credidit. See also Roth p. 187—189 [Halm p. 126—128].

4. Hieronym. II p. 821 Vall.: (de viris illustribus scripserunt) apud Latinos . . Varro (in his Imagines), Santra, Nepos, Hyginus et . . Tran-

quillus. Gell. XI 8, 5: in libro Corneli Nepotis de inlustribus viris XIII (on Cato). Charis. I p. 141 K.: Cornelius Nepos inlustrium XV, and: Cornelius Nepos inlustrium virorum libro XVI. cf. II p. 220, 12: Nepos de inlustribus viris II. Serv. Aen. I 368: Cornelius Nepos in eo libro qui Vita illustrium inscribitur. References to this are found in Corn. Nepos himself, X 3, 2: sed de hoc in eo libro plura sunt exposita qui de historicis graecis conscriptus est. praef. 8: in hoc exponemus libro de vita excellentium imperatorum. XXIII 13, 4: sed nos tempus est huius libri facere finem et Romanorum explicare imperatores, quo facilius, collatis utrorumque factis, qui viri praeferendi sint possit iudicari. Of the foreign imperatores he treats first of the Greeks and then, after a survey of the Greek kings who were also imperatores, of Hamilcar and Hannibal. Cf. XXI 1, 1: hi fere fuerunt graecae gentis duces (among them Datames) qui memoria digni videantur, praeter reges. namque eos attingere noluimus, quod omnium res gestae separatim sunt relatae (in the work de regibus). Works de poetis and de grammaticis seem to be indicated in quotations in Suetonius' vita Terent. 1. 3. gramm. 4 cf. Diomed. I p. 405 P. = 410, 9 K. Hence it appears that the viri illustres were distinguished according to their peculiar domains, and that here again foreigners (exterarum gentium or graeci) and Romans were treated of in parallel books, just as in Varro's Imagines (above 154, 5). The citations of lost books will be found in Roth's edition, p. 181 — 186 [Halm p. 121 sqq.]. For the whole work see also XVI 1, 1: vereor . . ne non vitam eius enarrare, sed historiam videar scribere. XV 1, 3: cum exprimere imaginem consuetudinis atque vitae velimus. XXV 19, 1: rerum exemplis lectores docebimus .. suos cuique mores plerumque conciliare fortunam. Moral tendencies appear also VIII 2, 3. 3, 2. The work was dedicated to Atticus: see praef. 1., and published between 719 and 721; an additional note was made to the biography of Atticus after his death, 725 or 726, at all events before 727, when Octavian (who had been imperator since 725) received the title of Augustus; see XXV 19, 2: in affinitatem pervenit Imperatoris, Divi filii.

5. Gell. XV 28, 1 expresses himself coolly: Cornelius Nepos rerum memoriae non indiligens. Quintilian does not mention him in his list of the Roman historians, and Pliny (n. 3, fin.) charges him with credulity. With the idea we thus conceive of his literary position the work we possess is in full agreement. It is difficult to find out his reason for selecting this or that general among the duces or imperatores and omitting such men as Brasidas, Aratus, Philopoemen, Cleomenes III and others; nor is his lengthy treatment in harmony with the importance of the events; he neglects important authorities, e. g. Herodotus, and those he uses he employs negligently and sometimes mistakes their meaning. The order of the duces and the arrangement of events in the biographies are void of plan, without just discrimination of important and unimportant facts; chronology is often neglected and undue attention devoted to curious anecdotes. He characterises his generals in a onesided manner, generally dwelling on their good

sides; in most cases the person in question is described as the greatest in his way. His style belongs to the genus tenue and is to a certain extent graceful so long as it keeps within short periods; but whenever the author attempts long periods, he signally fails. His command of phrases and words is not very great. Some expressions deviate from the classical usage, though they do not justify any attempt to assign the work to a later date. A period which produced Cicero and Caesar side by side with Varro and even such writers as the authors of the Bell. Afric. and Hispaniense, could well have a writer like Cornelius Nepos. All leads to the conclusion that he was a kind-hearted, honest man and author, though of moderate abilities. Cf. Nipperdey's Introd. (1849) p. XXI sq. XXVIII—XXXII.

6. Much confusion has been caused by an epigram of 6 distichs given by the mss. after the life of Hannibal (Riese, Anth. lat. 783) and in which the work is inscribed to Theodosius (I?), with the subscription Aemilii Probi de exc. duc. ext. gent. liber explicit. Relying on this many scholars, and especially Fr. W. Rinck, have attempted to vindicate the authorship of these vitae to Aemilius Probus, a writer of the time of Theodosius. But this being an impossible date for the whole work, on literary evidence, and the vitae of Cato and Atticus (which unquestionably belong to Cornelius Nepos) bearing the same characteristics of style and diction, it is evident that Aemilius Probus was merely the author of the epigram, with which he inscribed to Theodosius a copy of the work made by him. Bergk's guess (Phil. XII p. 580), that the first part of the name may be due only to a misapprehension of the subscription EM (endavi) PROBVS, is possible. There is no sufficient reason for assuming the present work to be a late abstract of the original work by Cornelius Nepos. See Madvig opusc. II 123, n. 1. Lachmann, Rhein. Mus. II (1843) p. 144. Fleckeisen, Philologus IV p. 345. Nipperdey (1849) p. XXXVI—XXXVIII.

7. De librorum numero et auctoritate in C. L. Roth's edition (1841) p. 207—243. 251—257. In spite of the great number of the mss., not one is older than the 12th century; the majority are of the 15th and as they agree in a gap in the life of Lysander, they are all derived from the same archetype. The oldest and most complete copies of this archetypus are those of Gifanius or Daniel, the Leidensis, the Parcensis at Louvain (Rh. Mus. VIII p. 626—639. W. Vischer, Philologus XXVI p. 706 sq.) and an Utrecht edition of 1542.

8. There are numerous editions; see Schweiger, class. Bibliographie II 1 p. 294 sqq. Bardili's Praef. p. XIX sqq. and on the oldest also Roth (1841) p. 243—251. Ed. princeps ap. Iensonum, Venet. 1471. fol. The principal editions are by Lambinus (Paris 1569. 4.), A. Schott (cum notis varr. Frankf. 1608. fol.), Böcler (Argentor. 1640), J. A. Bos (cur. Fischer, Lips. 1759), A. van Staveren (Lugd. Bat. 1734. 1773. Stuttg. 1820, 2 voll., cur. W. H. Bardili), J. M. Heusinger (cum. perp. ann., Eisenach 1747), J. H. Bremi (ed., illustr.. Zürich 1796. 1812. 1819. 1827), J. Ch. Dähne (ed. et ann. adi. Lips. 1827). The first critical

edition is by C. L. Roth, Aemilius Probus etc. praemissa sunt Rinckii prolegomena (p. I—CLXII), Basle 1841 [now superseded by C. Halm's edition, Leipzig 1871]. An excellent edition with German notes by C. Nipperdey, Leipxig 1849.

Texts by G. A. Koch (Lips. Tauchn. 1855), R. Dietsch (Lips. Teubner 1863), C. Nipperdey (Berlin 1867), C. Halm (Bibl. Teubner 1871).

Notes on Cornelius Nepos for translation into Greek by R. Volkmann, Leipzig 1862.

Critical observations by A. Fleckeisen (Philologus IV p. 308—351), Heerwagen (Collect., Baireuth 1849. 4.), C. Nipperdey (Spicilegium crit. in C. N., Lips. 1850; Spic. alterius P. I—VI. Jena 1868—1871. 4.).

W. F. Rinck, saggio di un esame critico etc. Venice 1818; translated into German by D. Hermann, Leipzig 1819; recast in C. L. Roth's edition. C. F. Ranke, comm. de C. N. vita et scriptis, Quedlinburg 1827. 4. A. Walicki, de C. N., Dorpat 1832. G. E. F. Lieberkühn, de auctore vitt. quae sub nomine C. N. feruntur, Lips. 1837; Vindiciae librorum iniuria suspectorum, Lips. 1844 (defensio C. N. contra Aem. Pr. librarium). J. Th. Lütkenhus, de C. N. vita et scriptis, Münster 1838. A. F. Nissen, de vitis quae vulgo C. N. nomine feruntur, Rendsburg 1839. 4. H. Peck, Jahn's Archiv X p. 73—98. Heerwagen, Munich Gel. Anz. 1846, nr. 28—32. A. Linsmayer, de vit. exc. Munich 1858. 4. Winkler, Contributions to the controversy concerning etc., Berl. Journal for Gymnasia XIX p. 433—443. L. Grasberger, on the value of C. N., Eos I p. 225—242.

De fontibus et auctoritate C. N. by J. F. Hisely (Delft 1827), R. H. Eys. Wichers (Gröningen 1828), A. Ekker (Acta soc. Rheno-Traiect. III. 1828. p. 193 sqq.). Quaestiones historicae in C. N. vitas by Freudenberg (Cologne 1839. Bonn 1841. 4.), Biedermann (Bonn 1842. 4.).

On the vita Alcibiadis J. Wiggers (Lips. 1833), Catonis A. F. R. S. van Heemfra (Lugd. Bat. 1825), Attici J. Held (Prolegomena, Breslau 1826).

Dornheim, Observations on the phraseology of C. N., Detmold 1861. 4.

R. Hanow, de C. N. a loco quem in scholis obtinet removendo, Züllichau 1850. 4. Against him Pomtow, Berlin Journal for Gymnasia XIV p. 897—925.

186. Among the scholars of the period, the next place to Varro was held by P. Nigidius Figulus (Praetor a. 696), whose extensive works dealt not only with grammar, but also with theology and various branches of science; yet as he was mainly directed to curious and strange things, he gained little influence and was soon perfectly eclipsed by Varro. L. Tarutius also devoted himself to Astrology, and Appius Claudius (Cons. 700) occupied himself with necromancy and

wrote on augural science. C. Marcellus, M. Messala (Cons. 701), L. Caesar and A. Caecina wrote treatises on the same. Veranius, Granius Flaccus, Aufustius and a certain Manilius wrote on kindred subjects.

1. P. Nigidius (Cic. p. Sull. 14, 42. Timae. 1. Plut. Cic. 20. an seni 27 and elsewhere) Figulus (see Schol. Lucan. I 639), Praetor 696 (Cic. ad Qu. fr. I 2, 5, 15), whence his birth-year cannot be fixed later than 656. Being a zealous partisan of Pompey, he was exiled by Caesar (Cic. ad fam. IV 13 a. 708). Hieron. on Eus. Chron. a. Abr. 1972 = Ol. 183, 4 = 709 V. C.: Nigidius Figulus Pythagoricus et magus in exilio moritur. In conformity with his Pythagorean views he was conservative in his politics and was useful to Cicero in his struggle with Catiline (p. Sull. and Plut. l. l.). The Orphic mysticism and magic tendencies of the Pythagorean teaching of that period appear also in Nigidius Figulus. Secret arts, recovering stolen objects (Apul. mag. 42), and conjecturing at nativity (Suet. Aug. 94. Dio XLV 1) are mentioned of him. Of conflicts with the police caused by this may be understood the sacrilegium Nigidianum in Ps. Cic. in Sall. resp. 5. See Mommsen R. H. III² p. 552 sq.

2. M. Hertz, de P. Nigidii Figuli studiis atque operibus, Berlin 1845. Quaestiones Nigidianae by J. Klein (de vita Nigidii, Bonn 1861) and J. Frey (Rössel 1867. 4.). His fragments have been collected by A. Riccobonus (Basle 1579), J. Rutgers (Var. lect., Lugd. B. 1618, III 16 p. 246—298); those on astronomy by R. Merkel, Ovid. Fast. p. LXXXVI sqq. A. Breysig, de N. F. fragmentis apud schol. Germanici servatis, Berlin 1854. F. Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. XIII p. 177 sqq.

3. Cic. Timae. 1: fuit vir ille cum ceteris artibus, quae quidem dignae libero essent, ornatus omnibus, tum acer investigator et diligens earum rerum quae a natura involutae videntur. denique sic iudico, post illos nobiles Pythagoreos . . hunc exstitisse qui illam (disciplinam) renovaret. Gell. IV 9, 1: Nigidius Figulus, homo, ut ego arbitror, iuxta M. Varronem doctissimus. Cf. ib. 16, 1. X 11, 2 (homo in omnium bonarum artium disciplinis egregius). XI 11, 1. XIII 26, 1. 5. XV 3, 5. XVII 7, 4. Schol. Bob. Cic. Vatin. p. 317 Or. Serv. Ae. X 175: Nigidius est solus post Varronem, licet Varro praecellat in theologia, hic in communibus litteris. nam uterque utrumque scripsit.

4. Commentarii grammatici probably in 30 books (Gell. X 5, 1: P. Nigidius dicit in commentariorum undetricesimo), in which he treated of grammar in its widest sense, also of orthography, synonyms, etymology, with a tendency to investigate the causes of facts, frequently in imitation of Varro. In his etymologies he clung to the Latin, e. g. he derived frater from fere alter. Gell. XVII 7, 5: anguste perquam et obscure disserit, ut signa rerum ponere videas ad subsidium magis memoriae suae quam ad legentium disciplinam. XIX 14, 3: Nigidianae commentationes non proinde (like those of Varro) in volgus

exeunt et obscuritas subtilitasque earum tamquam parum utilis derelicta est. He was perhaps the inventor of indicating a long vowel by apex, Rhein. Mus. XXIV 107 sq.

5. Quintil. XI 3, 143: qui de gestu scripserunt circa tempora illa (of the veteres), Plotius Nigidiusque.

6. P. Nigidius in libro quem de extis composuit, Gell. XVI 6, 12. Nigidius Figulus in libro primo augurii privati, ib. VII (VI) 6, 10. Lyd. de ostent. 45: ὁ Νιγίδιος ἐν τῇ τῶν ὀνείρων ἐπισκέψει. Cf. ib. 27 sqq. (ἐφήμερος βροντοσκοπία . . κατὰ τὸν Ῥωμαῖον Φίγουλον ἐκ τῶν Τάγητος).

7. Macrob. III 4, 6: Nigidius de dis libro nono decimo. Hence they would seem to have been at least 20. They embraced also questions of ritual, both Roman and foreign. . The fragments are collected in Merkel's Edition of the Fasti, p. CLXXXV sqq.

8. His works on Natural Science. Cic. Tim. 1. (see above n. 3). a) on Astronomy Serv. Ge. I 43: Nigidius in Sphaera graecanica; 218: Nigidius commentario Sphaerae graecanicae. ib. 19: Nigidius . . Sphaerae barbaricae. On their relation see Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. XIII p. 177—188. — b) P. Nigidii in secundo librorum quos de vento composuit verba, Gell. II 22, 31. Nigidius de ventis IIII ait, Schol. Bern. Georg. I 428. According to Wachsmuth (Lyd. de ostent. p. XXIV—XXVI) Lydus' observations on weather-marks (ost. p. 19 sq.) are derived from this source. — c) On Zoology. Gell. VI (VII) 9, 5: P. Nigidius de animalibus libro II. Macrob. III 16, 7: Nigidius Figulus . . in . . libro de animalibus quarto. Rutgers p. 270 sqq. Serv. Ae. I 178: Nigidius de hominum naturalibus IIII (on generation); cf. Plin. N. H. VII 15, 66 sq. — The existence of a treatise de terris is maintained by J. Klein p. 26.

9. Cic. de divin. II 47, 98: L. Tarutius Firmanus, familiaris noster, in primis Chaldaeicis rationibus eruditus, urbis nostrae natalem diem repetebat etc. Cf. Plut. Romul. 12. Lyd. de mens. I 14 (Ταρρούτιος ὁ μαθηματικός). Above 182, 6. Mommsen, Rom. Chronol.[2] p. 145 sqq.

10. Appius Claudius Ap. f. Pulcher, Augur after 695, Praetor 697, Cons. 700, Cicero's predecessor in the proconsulate of Cilicia, Censor 704, † 706; a genuine pattern of the average type of the patricians of that time, who indulged himself in everything, while he was strict to others, a man of such shallow information as to expose himself to all taunts. See A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. II p. 412—415, nr. 41, and Bull. dell' inst. arch. 1860, p. 225—233. 1861, p. 63 sq. C. I. lat. I 619 p. 181 sq. Cic. Brut. 77, 267: Appius Claudius, collega et familiaris meus, . . et satis studiosus et valde cum doctus tum etiam exercitatus orator et cum auguralis tum omnis publici iuris antiquitatisque nostrae bene peritus fuit. Tusc. I 16, 37: ea quae meus amicus (for the time) Appius νεκυομαντεῖα faciebat. de divin. I 58, 132: psychomantia, quibus Appius . . uti solebat. ad fam. III 4, 1 (a. 703) he writes to him: illo libro augurali quem ad me amantissime scriptum suavissimum misisti. de legg. II 13, 32: est . . inter Marcellum (C. Claudius Marcellus, Cons.

704 or the one of 705) et Appium, optimos augures, magna dissensio (nam eorum ego in libros incidi), cum alteri placeat auspicia ad utilitatem reip. composita, alteri disciplina vestra (augurum) quasi divinari videntur posse. From de divin. II 35, 75, the latter appears to have been the opinion of Appius. Fest. v. sollistimum, p. 298 M.: Ap. Pulcher in auguralis disciplinae libro I ait. See also Cic. ad fam. III 9, 3. 11, 4.

11. M. Valerius Messala, Cons. 701; see A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 2 p. 2347—2349, nr. 77. Macrob. I 9, 14: M. Messala, Cn. Domitii in consulatu collega idemque per annos LV augur, de Iano ita incipit. (cf. Lyd. mens. 4, 1) Gell. XIII 14, 5 sq. (on pomoerium). 15, 3 (liber M. Messalae auguris de auspiciis primus). 16, 1 (Messala in eodem libro). Fest. p. 157. 161 (Messala augur in explanatione auguriorum). He is probably identical with Valerius Messala whose explanatio XII tabularum is quoted by Festus p. 253. 321. 355 and who also wrote de dictis involute (Fest. p. 321). See R. Schöll, XII tabb. p. 37.

12. Priscian VIII p. 791 P. = 380. 3 sq. H.: Lucius Caesar: certaeque res augurantur. Fest. p. 161 M.: maiorem consulem L. Caesar putat dici eum qui etc. Hence the quotations in Priscian VI p. 719 P. = 270, 5 H. (Caesar in Auguralibus) and Macrob. I 16, 29 (Iulius Caesar XVI° Auspiciorum libro negat nundinis contionem advocari posse) become more distinct.

13. Plinius N. H. I, authorities of b. II: Caecina, qui de etrusca disciplina (scripsit). Cic. ad fam. VI 6, 3 (a. 708 or 709 to Caecina): si te ratio quaedam etruscae disciplinae, quam a patre . . acceperas, non fefellit. Sen. nat. quaest. II 56, 1: haec (on fulguratio) apud Caecinam invenio, facundum virum et qui habuisset aliquando in eloquentia nomen, nisi illum Ciceronis umbra pressisset. Cf. ib. 39, 1. 49, 1. Schol. Veron. to Aen. X 198 (p. 103 sq. ed. Keil). Cic. ad fam. VI 9 (a. 708): et patre eius . . plurimum usi sumus et hunc a puero, quod et spem magnam mihi afferebat summae . eloquentiae et vivebat mecum coniunctissime . . etiam studiis communibus, semper dilexi. He seems to have written that treatise at a later period. It is somewhat difficult to discriminate father and son in the various passages. The father seems identical with Caecina (above 166, 13) defended by Cicero a. 685. Suet. Caes. 75: Auli Caecinae criminosissimo libro . . laceratam existimationem suam civili animo tulit. Yet Caesar had banished him from Italy for that reason, in spite of the attack belonging to the time of open war: armatus adversario male dixi, are Caecina's words in his lively letter (of a. 708) in Cic. ad Fam. VI 7 (see Zimmermann p. 48—58), with which he sent a work in prose he had written in Sicily and which was, perhaps, in the form of a letter to Caesar — through it he hoped to recover his liberty. It was entitled Querulae; see ib. 6, 8: (Caesar) mitis clemensque natura, qualis exprimitur praeclaro illo libro Querelarum tuarum. After the African war Caesar seems to have pardoned him (b. afr. 89). He is recommended in a letter a. 708, Cic. ad fam. VI 9. XIII 66: hominis omnibus

mecum studiis officiisque coniunctissimi; he is to be assisted in reliquiis veteris negotiationis (in Asia, cf. ad fam. VI 6, 2. 8, 2) colligendis. Drumann H. of R. VI p. 279 sqq. A. H. G. Zimmermann, de A. Caecina scriptore, Berlin 1852.

14. Veranius in eo qui est auspiciorum de comitiis, Festus v. referri, p. 289 a, M. Hence Veranius would seem to belong to the republican time, at all events he is not later than Augustus. Festus p. 158 a: Veranius in libro [quem inscripsit priscarum vo]cum, according to Ursinus' supplement. Cf. ib. p. 203. 205. 250. 253. 348. Veranius Pontificalium eo libro quem fecit de supplicationibus, Macrob. III 6, 14; cf. ib. 5, 6 (in Pontificalibus quaestionibus). ib. 2, 3 sq.: Veranius ex primo libro Pictoris (see above 105, 7) on porricere. ib. 20, 2: Veranius de verbis pontificalibus. Veranius Flaccus is quite isolated in Suet. Oct. 86 (below 206, 12), and perhaps Verrius Flaccus or Granius Flaccus is meant. See also below 218, fin.

15. Censorin. d. n. 3, 2: Granius Flaccus in libro quem ad Caesarem de indigitamentis scriptum reliquit. Paul. Dig. L 16, 144: Gr. Fl. in libro de iure papiniano (above 59, 1) scribit. Comp. Macrob. I 18, 4 (Varro et Gr. Fl.). Fest. v. ricae, p. 277 M. (Gran.). Solin. II 40 (p. 44, 18 M.: Granius tradit). Arnob. adv. nat. III 31. 38. VI 7. But perhaps Solinus and Arnobius may mean Granius Licinianus.

16. Paul. Diac. (i. e. Verrius Flaccus) p. 94 sq. M.: Aufustius genius, inquit, est deorum filius etc. Priscian VIII 17 p. 383, 9 H.: Aufustius: omnia argumentata nomina etc. Hence it becomes probable that in an excerpt (from Varro) ap. Eichenfeld and Endlicher (Anal. gramm., Vienna 1836) p. 452 not.: abnesti fusti grammatici liber ad Asinium Pollionem, we should emend Aufusti gramm.; see Usener, Rh. Mus. XXIV 101, cf. p. 104 and 111, n. 13.

17. Side by side with Granius, Aelius, Varro, Cornificius, Cincius, Manilius is mentioned as a writer on novensiles by Arnob. adv. gent. III 38 sq. Cf. Festus v. sexagenarios, p. 334 a: cuius causam Mani[lius hanc refert].

18. For Cornelius Balbus see below 196, 4.

187. Many other scholars who were at the same time teachers, lived in great poverty, e. g. the critic Valerius Cato, who wrote also poems on erotic and mythological subjects, though he was not the author of the two poems Dirae and Lydia which we still possess. In a similar position was the firm, though morose Orbilius Pupillus of Beneventum (a. 640 — c. 737), and some freedmen, among whom we may mention Curtius Nicias.

1. Suet. gramm. 11 p. 109 sq. Rffsch.: (P.?) Valerius Cato, ut nonnulli tradiderunt, Burseni cuiusdam libertus ex Gallia (cisalpina?);

ipse libello cui est titulus Indignatio ingenuum se natum ait et pupillum relictum eoque facilius licentia Sullani temporis exutum patrimonio (probably born about 664). docuit multos et nobiles visusque est peridoneus praeceptor, maxime ad poeticam tendentibus. . . is scripsit praeter grammaticos libellos etiam poemata, ex quibus praecipue probantur Lydia et Diana. . . vixit ad extremam senectam, sed in summa pauperie et paene inopia, . . postquam Tusculana villa creditoribus cesserat. Helvius Cinna out of friendship praises ib. his Diana (Dictynna) as an immortal work. Bibaculus ib.: mei domum Catonis calling him unicum magistrum, summum grammaticum, optimum poetam. Another poem is mentioned ib.: Cato grammaticus, latina Siren, qui solus legit ac facit poetas. In this way he studied especially Lucilius, see the first lines of Horace, Sat. I 10; cf. Suet. gramm. 2 extr. Ib. 4: Valerium Catonem, poetam simul grammaticumque notissimum. Ovid, Trist. II 436, seems to allude to the erotic subjects of his poems: et leve Cornifici parque Catonis opus. Cf. Schwabe, Quaest. Catull. p. 305—312. It is not known whether his Indignatio was in metre.

2. The poem entitled Dirae consists of 183 hexameters and contains imprecations caused by the loss of an estate during the civil wars, but the second part (v. 104—183) relates to a beloved girl, Lydia. It is found in the mss. of the carmina minora erroneously attributed to Virgil. J. Scaliger, Näke and others ascribed it to Valerius Cato. But the poem clearly alludes to the agrarian distributions of a. 713: see K. F. Hermann, Collected Essays, p. 114—118. Merkel on Ovid's Ibis p. 361. F. Jacobs, Misc. Writings V p. 639 sqq., saw that the poem should be divided into two; its strophic arrangement, marked by burdens and in the Bembine ms. by rubricated initials, was discovered by K. F. Hermann, l. l. 118—131, and F. C. Göbbel, de ephymn. rationibus (Gött. 1858) p. 48—56, and on the strophic composition of the Dirae, Warendorf 1861, and Valeri Catonis quae feruntur carmina, rec. notisque instruxit . . praemissus est libellus de Dirarum compositione strophica emendatus, Warendorf 1865. There is no sure trace of a second speaker and alternating singing; the Battarus of these Dirae is only the person addressed. The cause and author of these two poems are the same in both, comp. Dir. 20 with Lyd. 13; in the Dirae it is stated that the separation from his beloved Lydia renders the loss of the estate doubly painful (41. 89. 95 sqq.), though it is not stated why Lydia must remain at the estate. In the 'Lydia' the estate is envied the possession of the beloved girl whose loss is bewailed at the expense of mythology and in the sentimental, unworthy tone of some of the elegiac poets of the Augustan age, to the beginning of which this poem clearly belongs. It was attributed to Virgil, because he also had lost his estate a. 713; but there is no further agreement between this poem and Virgil either in point of history, mode of thought or other circumstances. — Editions: Catalecta Virgilii . . cum comm. Ios. Scaligeri, Lugd. Bat. 1617, p. 169 sqq.; in Burmann's Anthol. lat. II p. 649 sqq. and Wernsdorf's poetae lat. min. III in. Cum brevi annot. crit. ed. H. C. A. Eichstaedt, Jena 1826. 4. Rec. et . .

illustr. C. Putsche, Jena 1828. Hence in Meyer's Anthol. lat. 108 and in F. A. Giles, London 1838. V. C. carmina cum animadv. A. F. Naekii. accedunt . . de V. C. eiusque vita ac poesi . . diss. cura L. Schopeni, Bonn 1847. Dirarum carmen enarratum et recognitum ed. O. Ribbeck, Kiel 1867. 4. and in his Appendix Vergiliana (1868) p. 165—178. cf. p. 22 sq. 50—61. Critical observations by M. Schmidt (Philol. VIII p. 190—192) and F. C. Göbbel (Berlin Journal for Gymn. 1866 p. 584—590).

3. Suet. gramm. 9: (L.?) Orbilius Pupillus Beneventanus . . primo apparituram magistratibus fecit, deinde in Macedonia corniculo, mox equo meruit, functusque militia studia repetit, quae iam inde a puero non leviter attigerat; ac professus diu in patria quinquagesimo demum anno Romam consule Cicerone (a. 691) transiit, docuitque maiore fama quam emolumento. namque iam persenex pauperem se . . quodam scripto fatetur. librum etiam cui est titulus *Περιαλγής* edidit continentem querelas de iniuriis quas professores neglegentia aut ambitione parentum acciperent. fuit autem naturae acerbae . . etiam in discipulos, for which he alleges Horace (Ep. II 1, 71) and Domitius Marsus. ac ne principum quidem virorum insectatione abstinuit. . . vixit prope ad centesimum aetatis annum. . . statua eius Beneventi ostenditur in Capitolio. Ib. 4 and 8 may perhaps be from one of his works. According to Wiss, Reissig and others, he is the grammaticorum equitum doctissimus whose acerbity is by Horace (Sat. I 10, 4 sqq.) contrasted with the mild judgment of Valerius Cato and who endeavours to train puerum (perhaps Scribonius Aphrodisiensis, Suet. gramm. 19) to become the champion of the old poets. — A. G. Lange, In memory of Orbilius, in his Misc. Writings, p. 182—188.

4. Suet. gramm. 14: Curtius Nicia adhaesit Cn. Pompeio et C. Memmio; sed cum codicillos Memmi et Pompei uxorem de stupro pertulisset proditus ab ea Pompeium offendit domoque ei interdictum est. fuit et Ciceronis familiaris, in support of which he quotes his letter ad Dolabellam (where he says Niciam nostrum) and ad Att. (XII 26, 2 of a. 709: de Nicia quod scribis, si ita me haberem ut eius humanitate frui possem in primis vellem illum mecum habere. . . praeterea nosti Niciae nostri imbecillitatem, mollitiam, consuetudinem victus). huius de Lucilio libros (see above 122, 5) etiam Santra comprobat.

188. The Stoic system was raised by Cato the younger (a. 659—708) who openly professed it and realised its principles in his words, life, and death. The rigidity of the Stoic philosophy was in perfect agreement with the unyielding obstinacy of Cato's character, which was however inseparable from a certain onesidedness and narrowness of mind.

1. M. Porcius Cato, the great-grandson of Censorius, was born 659, became Quaestor 689, trib. pleb. 692, Praetor 700, and caused his own death at Utica after the battle of Thapsus, in April 708, that he might

not survive the downfall of the Republic. Though wanting in polical acumen and mental energy, he deserves great respect for his faithfulness, firmness and unselfishness in serving the cause of the Republic. Compare Plutarch's Cato minor, which is probably derived from Paetus Thrasea. His character is delineated in Sall. Cat. 54. W. Drumann, Hist. of Rome V p. 153—198. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 1911—1915, nr. 20. H. Köchly, Academical Lectures, I p. 53—152. H. Wartmann, Life of Cato of Utica, Zurich 1858. F. D. Gerlach, M. Porcius Cato the younger, Basle 1866.

2. Erroneously a. Abr. 1948 = Ol. 177, 4 = 685 V. C. Hieronym. Eus. Chron.: M. Porcius Cato stoicus philosophus agnoscitur. Cic. Brut. 31, 118: stoici . . traducti a disputando ad dicendum inopes reperiuntur. unum excipio Catonem, in quo perfectissime stoico summam eloquentiam non desiderem. 119: habet a stoicis id quod ab illis petendum fuit, sed dicere didicit a dicendi magistris eorumque more se exercuit. legg. III 18, 40: nec est umquam longa oratione utendum, nisi aut peccante senatu . . tolli diem utile est aut cum tanta causa est ut opus sit oratoris copia; . . quorum generum in utroque magnus noster Cato est. For the use he made of philosophy see above 40, 3 fin. Quintil. XI 1, 36: Cato eloquens senator fuit. Plut. Cato min. 5: *ὁ λόγος νεαρὸν μὲν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ κομψὸν εἶχεν, ἀλλ' ἦν ὄρθιος καὶ περιπαθὴς καὶ τραχύς.* ib. 23: *τοῦτον μόνον ὧν Κάτων εἶπε διασώζεσθαί φασι τὸν λόγον* the speech against the Catilinarians, as he says that Cicero caused it to be taken down in writing, if indeed this be not a confusion with the speech attributed to him by Sallust. Schneider, de Catone Uticensi oratore, Ztschr. f. AW. 1843, nr. 112 sq. For Cato's iambics against Metellus Scipio who had deprived him of his bride, see above 27, 2. The only composition we possess by him is his letter to Cicero of a. 704, ad fam. XV 5. — Plin. N. H. VII 30, 113: Uticensis Cato unum ex tribunatu militum (a. 687) philosophum, alterum ex Cypria legatione (a. 696) deportavit (to Rome). He was very intimate with the Stoic philosophers Antipater of Tyre (Plut. 4), Athenodorus (ib. 10), Apollonides (ib. 65 sq.), but also with the Peripatetic Demetrius (ib.) and with Philostratus (ib. 57).

3. Immediately on his death Cato's character became a subject of political controversy; see above 192, 7 and below 212, 2. 217, 3. But even under the Julian dynasty the opposition delighted in glorifying Cato and his death both in verse and in prose.

189. In law, Caesar designed to collect the whole existing ius civile in a Corpus, in which task he was assisted by the learned lawyer A. Ofilius, whose literary exertions extended over the entire domain of law. After him, the most eminent jurist of this age was Cicero's young friend C. Trebatius Testa, a man of great culture and much wit, whose life extends into the Augustan age and who was the teacher of Antistius

Labeo. Of about the same age as Trebatius were the jurist A. Cascellius, a man of Republican mind, firm character, and much wit, and L. Valerius.

1. Suet. Caes. 44: (destinabat) ius civile ad certum modum redigere atque ex immensa diffusaque legum copia optima quaeque et necessaria in paucissimos conferre libros. Isid. Orig. V 1, 5: leges redigere in libros primus cos. Pompeius instituere voluit, sed non perseveravit, obtrectatorum metu (probably of the jurists). deinde Caesar coepit id facere, sed ante interfectus est.

2. A. Ofilius, a pupil of Ser. Sulpicius, see above 161, 5. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 44: ex his auditoribus plurimum auctoritatis habuit Alfenus Varus et A. Ofilius, ex quibus . . Ofilius in equestri ordine perseveravit. is fuit Caesari familiarissimus et libros de iure civili plurimos et qui omnem partem operis fundarent reliquit. nam de legibus vicesimae (rather with Sanio, Essays on the History of Law, 1845, p. 78: XX = de legibus viginti libros) conscripsit (et) de iurisdictione (on the law of magistrates; cf. Dig. XXVI 7, 36), idem edictum praetoris (cf. Dig. II, 7, 1, 2. XLIII, 20, 1, 17. 21, 3, 10) primus diligenter composuit. (45.) . . ex his Trebatius peritior Cascellio, Cascellius Trebatio eloquentior fuisse dicitur, Ofilius utroque doctior. Both Tubero (ib. 46) and Ateius Capito (ib. 47) were his pupils. In the Digest Ofilius is quoted Ofilius libr. V iuris partiti (XXXII, 55, 1. 4. 7), Of. libr. XVI actionum (XXXIII, 9, 3. 5. 8), Of. ad Atticum (L, 16, 234, 2). Mentions as a jurist, cf. Cic. ad Fam. VII 21 (a. 710) and perhaps ad Att. XIII 37, 4 (a. 709) cf. Fam. XVI, 24, 1 (a. 710). Rudorff, History of Roman Law I p. 164.

3. Pompon. Dig. I, 2, 2, 45: fuit eodem tempore (with Ofilius) et Trebatius, qui idem (quidem? or Trebatius, Quinti C. M. auditor. fuit ex etc.) Cornelii Maximi (above 141, 4) auditor fuit. ex his Trebatius peritior etc. (see n. 2). . . Trebatii complures (libri exstant), sed minus frequentantur. 47: Antistius Labeo . . institutus est a Trebatio. C. Trebatius Testa was born about 665 at Velia in Lucania, came to Rome as an adulescens and there became acquainted with Cicero, who recommended him to Caesar in Gaul (ad fam. VII 5) to improve his fortune. In Gaul he remained for at least one year. Of this period we have Cicero's letters to him, ad fam. VII 6—18, in a. 710 ib. 19—21, and of uncertain date ib. 22. Henceforth he remained on Caesar's side, though not as a fiery zealot, and the same he was under Augustus; see Hor. S. II, 1. Justinian Inst. II, 25 pr.: dicitur Augustus convocasse prudentes, inter quos Trebatium quoque, cuius tunc auctoritas maxima erat. He seems to have been living about a. 740. Porphyrio on Hor. l. l. (p. 200 Hauth.): ad Trebatium scribit equitem romanum (this he may have become through Octavianus; see W. Teuffel on Hor. S. II, 1, 29). hic est Trebatius iuris peritus, qui locum obtinuit inter poetas (a trait quite in harmony with the character of an easy bon-vivant). et aliquot libros de civili iure composuit et de religionibus novem (or

rather XI?). See also Gell. VII (VI) 12, 4: C. Trebatius . . in libro de religionibus secundo; Macrob. III 7, 8 (Trebatius Religionum libro nono) and 3, 5 (Trebatius libro decimo Religionum); cf. ib. I 16, 28. III 3, 2. 4. 5, 1. Serv. Aen. XI 316 (Trebatius de religionibus libro VII). Traces of his legal writings, especially of his commentary on the Edictum aedilium, occur in the Digest (IV 3, 18, 3 sq. XXI 1, 6, 1. 12, 4. 14, 3. cf. Gell. IV 2, 9 sq.). cf. also Dig. XI 7, 14, 11. XXXII 100, 1. 3. XLI 2, 3, 5. XLIII 24, 22, 3. S. W. Zimmern, Hist. of Roman Private Law I 1. p. 297—299. O. Stange, de C. Tr. T. et de eo loco quem inter aequales tenuerit, Berlin 1849. A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. VI 2. p. 2078—2080. W. Teuffel, Notes on Hor. Sat. II (Leipzig 1857), p. 10—14.

4. Pompon. l. l. 45: A. Cascellius, Quintus Mucius Volusii auditor, denique in illius honorem testamento Publium Mucium nepotem eius reliquit heredem. Volusii should probably be changed to Volcatii, in accordance with N. H. VIII 40, 144: Volcatium nobilem, qui Cascellium ius civile docuit. The relation in which Q. Mucius (above 141, 1) should be placed to the rest, is doubtful: either Q. Mucii et Volcatii auditor (cf. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. V p. 188 sq. Nr. 21) or Q. Mucii auditoris Volcatii auditor (Mommsen). Pomp. l. l. relates on Cascellius: fuit autem quaestorius, nec ultra proficere voluit, cum illi etiam Augustus consulatum offerret. ex his etc. (note 2). Cascellii scripta non exstant nisi unus liber bene dictorum (perhaps a collection of his witticisms by some one else, see above 110, 6. 178, 2.). Val. Max. VI 2, 12: Cascellius, vir iuris civilis scientia clarus, quam periculose contumax! nullius enim aut gratia aut auctoritate compelli potuit ut de aliqua earum rerum quas triumviri dederant formulam componeret, hoc animi iudicio universa eorum beneficia extra omnem ordinem legum ponens. idem cum multa de temporibus liberius loqueretur (under Augustus) . . duas res . . magnam sibi licentiam praebere respondit, senectutem et orbitatem. See also Hor. Ep. II 3, 371 (where he is mentioned as living). Quintil. VI 3, 87. Macrob. II 6, 1 (Cascellius iuris consultus urbanitatis mirae libertatisque habebatur, where one of his jokes is quoted of a. 698.) He is in all probability the author of the iudicium Cascellianum sive secutorium in Gai. Inst. IV 166. 169. He is quoted Dig. XXXII 100 pr. XXXIII 6, 7 pr. XXXV 1, 40, 1. E. G. Lagemans, de A. Cascellio icto, Lugd. Bat. 1823. 4. Zimmern, Hist. of Roman Private Law I 1. p. 299 sq. H. E. Dirksen, the jurist A. Casc., a contemporary of Cicero, Berlin 1858. 4.

5. L. Valerius iureconsultus, ex domesticis atque intimis familiaribus of Cicero (ad fam. III 1, 3 of a. 702), witty like his contemporary and colleague Trebatius (ib. I 10), and as it seems, a native of Apulia (Apuliam tuam, ib. a. 700). Not improbably he is meant ib. VII 11, 2 (a. 701, in a letter to Trebatius): si diutius frustra abfueris, non modo Laberium sed etiam sodalem nostrum Valerium pertimesco. mira enim persona induci potest Britannici iureconsulti; whence we should conclude that he also wrote mimi. cf. Schwabe, Quaest. Catull. p. 25 sq. It may

be that he is the Valerius who is mentioned as a commentator on the XII Tables (above 76, 6).

6. Antistius Labeo, the father of the famous jurist of this name and himself a jurist (Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 44), was one of the conspirators against Caesar, † 712. Comp. Appian B. C. IV 135 (*ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ γνωμίου*). Pauly's Encyclop. I 1. p. 1163, n. 21. If his praenomen was Pacuvius (M. Hertz on Priscian p. 384 and in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 91 p. 215), he is probably meant in Gellius V 21, 10: prima epistula (of Sinnius Capito) scripta est ad Pacuvium Labeonem.

7. On Alfenus Varus see below 205, 2.

190. The most distinguished orators of this period were especially M. Calidius (Praetor 697), and the talented but immoral C. Memmius (Praetor 696), who also attempted metrical composition and is known through his connexion with Lucretius and perhaps also Catullus. As speakers may be mentioned C. Manilius and P. Sestius, L. Herennius Balbus and the well-known enemy of Cicero, P. Clodius.

1. Jerome Eus. Chron. ad a. Abr. 1960 = Ol. 180, 4 = 697 M. Calidius orator clarus habetur, qui bello postea civili (a. 707) Caesarianas partes secutus (cf. Caes. b. c. I 2), cum togatam Galliam regeret, Placentiae obiit. According to the same, a. Abr. 1953 = Ol. 179, 1, Apollodorus of Pergamum was his master in eloquence. His oratorical character is delineated by Cic. Brut. 79, 274—80, 278 where we read e. g.: non fuit orator unus e multis, potius inter multos prope singularis fuit, ita reconditas exquisitasque sententias mollis et pellucens vestiebat oratio. . . accedebat ordo rerum plenus artis, actio liberalis, totumque dicendi placidum et sanum genus. . . nec erat ulla vis atque contentio. cf. Vellei. II 36, 2. Quintil. XII 10, 11 (subtilitas) 39. He belonged to the New Attic School. Fragments of his speech in Q. Gallium (of a. 690) in Festus v. sufer, p. 309 M. and Nonius p. 208, 27. See also Quintil. X 1, 23. A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. II p. 74. H. Meyer, orat. fragm.[2] p. 436—439.

2. Cic. Brut. 70, 247: C. Memmius L. f. perfectus litteris, sed graecis, fastidiosus sane latinarum; argutus orator verbisque dulcis, sed fugiens non modo dicendi verum etiam cogitandi laborem. Yet his erotic poems (see above 26, 1 and cf. Ovid Trist. II 433: Memmi carmen) do not seem to have been in Greek. He was a trib. pl. 688. As praetor (696) he opposed Caesar, but was subsequently gained over by him (Suet. Caes. 73: Gai Memmi, cuius asperrimis orationibus non minore acerbitate rescripserat, etiam suffragator mox in petitione consulatus fuit). He was propraetor in Bithynia a. 697 sq., when Helvius Cinna and Catullus were in his Cohors (see below 211, 3); a. 701 he was accused of ambitus when a candidate for the consulship; he then went to

Greece into exile and there died about 705. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1755 sq. n. 8. Grenzboten 1869. II p. 129—143.

3. C. Manilius, as trib. pl. 688 the author of the lex Manilia, for which Livy let him hold a contio bona (Liv. ep. 100.) L. O. Bröcker in Pauly's Encyclop. IV p. 1482 sq. n. 6.

4. P. Sestius, Quaestor 691, trib. pl. 697, Propraetor in Cilicia a. 704 (Plut. Brut. 4), afterwards on Caesar's side. On the tediousness of his speech against Antius in a causa civilis see Catullus 44, 10 sqq. Cicero who defended him a. 698 (see above 166, 32) thought little of his talents (ἰδιώτης Plut. Cic. 26; nihil umquam legi scriptum σησταιωδέστερον, ad Att. VII 17, 2). W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. VI 1. p. 1128 sq. Nr. 6.

5. L. Herennius Balbus, a. 698 joint accuser of M. Caelius (Cic. p. Cael. 11, 25 sqq.) and a. 702 one of the accusers of Milo (Ascon. p. 35 Or.)

6. P. Clodius Pulcher, quaestor a. 693, trib. pl. 696, † 702; see Drumann, Roman Hist. II p. 199—370. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. II p. 415—420. C. W. Elberling, narratio de P. Cl. P., Copenh. 1839. Cic. p. Cael. 11, 27: P. Clodius . . cum inflammatus ageret . . voce maxima, tametsi probabam eius eloquentiam, tamen non pertimescebam; aliquot enim in causis eum videram frustra litigantem. A. 700 he appeared as the accuser of Procilius and the defender of M. Scaurus.

201. *) T. Lucretius Carus (probably a. 656—699) in his didactic poem de rerum natura in six books treated of physics, psychology and (though briefly) of Epicurean Ethics, in imitation of the manner of Empedocles and Ennius. Though there can be no doubt that it was no happy idea to deal with such a dry and mechanical doctrine, the enthusiasm with which he represents it as the saving from the darkness of superstition, and the honest zeal with which he impugns false idols, are elevating to witness, and the mental power and perseverance evinced in his struggle with his hard subject-matter deserve indeed the greatest admiration. In many passages the poet's high genius breaks though all the fetters of his original design. The tone pervading the whole work is sad and mournful and in many passages even bitter; his style is unequal and frequently awkward, his diction trenchant, bold, and of a harshness which possesses a peculiar attraction. In consequence of his mode of thought and writing being so averse to his own time and directed to a better future, the

*) For the reason of the transition from 191 to 201 see the Preface.

poet received little attention in his own age, but the Augustan poets were greatly influenced by him. Many peculiarities of the work should be explained from the fact that it was not completed and edited by the author himself.

1. Jerome on Euseb. Chr. ad a. Abr. 1923 = Ol. 171, 3 = 660: T. Lucretius poeta nascitur. postea amatorio poculo in furorem versus, cum aliquot libros per intervalla insaniae conscripsisset, quos postea Cicero emendavit, propria se manu interfecit anno aetatis XLIV. Hence the year of his death would be 703 or 704. On the other hand, Donatus vita Vergil. 2 says: XV° anno virilem togam cepit, illis consulibus iterum quibus natus erat (i. e. 699. Cn. Pompeio II and M. Licinio Crasso II), evenitque ut eo ipso die Lucretius poeta decederet. Assuming that the number of his years is rightly given, this would lead to a. 655 or 656 as the year in which he was born. But again a different account is found in the Appendix of the Glossae Salomonis: Titu lucretius poeta nascitur sub consulibus. anñ XX U: II añ uirgilium. This would lead to a. 657, but by inserting I or II might be easily brought to XXVIII or XXVIIII years before 684, i. e. to the date given by Donatus (see Rh. Mus. XXII p. 444 sq.). In favour of the latter may be alleged that Cicero's words on Lucretius in a. 700 (see n. 2), relative to his edition of his poem, presuppose the poet's death. Should we now suppose an error on Jerome's side, this would scarcely require a poor explanation as might be found in his mistaking the Consuls of a. 656, Q. Caecilius and T. Didius, with those of 660, Q. Caelius and L. Domitius (Rh. Mus. XXII p. 445). Opinions are also divided as to the value of the other statements of Jerome. See Lachmann on Lucr. p. 63: ego in Hieronymianis nihil omnino quod credi non possit invenio: neque enim totam poësin per intervalla insaniae compositam dicit, sed aliquam partem. But at all events he says aliquot libros, and there are altogether only six of them. The mere fact of an Epicurean and atheist being stated to have ended in this terrible manner and the assertion that a work like his was composed in the lucid intervals of his insanity, should caution us against any rash acceptance of these statements, not to speak of the miraculous philtre said to have been administered to Lucretius. -- See Th. Bergk in the Marburg list of lectures 1846 sq. Fr. Polle, Philol. XXVI p. 561—565. J. Jessen, Festgruss, Kiel 1869, p. 52 sqq.

2. By 'Cicero' Jerome no doubt meant the famous orator and not Quintus, nor is there any other argument in favour of the latter. But doubts might be raised against the credibility of the whole affair on account of Cicero's entire silence as to it, though as a rule it is not his habit to be silent on his own performances; he never quotes Lucretius and even judges of him very coolly, ad Qu. fr. II 11, 4 (a. 700): Lucretii poemata (*ποιήματα*, prelections; cf. Gell. I 21, 5: in carminibus Lucreti) ut scribis ita sunt: multis luminibus ingenii, non multae tamen artis. sed cum ad umbilicum veneris (according to Bergk's

emendation), virum te putabo; si Sallustii Empedoclea legeris, hominem non putabo. At all events, Cicero's part was not very important, and it might almost seem that he was afraid of publishing a work of this kind. It cannot be alleged as an argument in support of the very dubious assertion of Pliny (Ep. III 15, 1) M. Tullium mira benignitate poetarum ingenia fovisse. It would be more just from Lucretius' imitations of Cicero's Aratea (see Munro on Lucr. V 619. p. 598) to infer the existence of a certain connexion between the two. See also Cornel. Nep. Att. 12, 4: quem post Lucretii Catullique mortem multo elegantissimum poetam nostram tulisse aetatem etc. Ovid. Am. I 15, 23. Trist. II 425. Vitruv. IX 3. Vellej. II 36, 2: auctores carminum Varronem ac Lucretium. Quintil. X 1, 87: Macer et Lucretius legendi quidem, sed non ut phrasin, i. e. corpus eloquentiae faciant. elegantes in sua quisque materia, sed alter humilis, alter (Lucr.) difficilis. Stat. Silv. II 7, 76: docti furor arduus Lucreti. Horace shows his acquaintance with Lucretius in several passages in his Satires, e. g. I 1, 13 (Lucr. II 104. V 164). 118 sq. (Lucr. III 938). 3, 38 sqq. (Lucr. IV 1153 sqq.) 5, 101 (Lucr. V 82). 6, 4 (Lucr. III 1028). 18 (Lucr. III 69). O. I 26, 6 (Lucr. IV 2). Even Od. IV 7, 15 the bonus Ancus of Lucretius (III 1025) is found. E. Göbel, Ztschr. f. öst. Gymn. 1857, p. 421—427. Gell. I 21, 7: non verba sola, sed versus prope totos et locos quoque Lucreti plurimos sectatum esse Virgilium videmus. cf. Macrob. VI 1. 2. and below 224, 6 fin. In Georg. II 490 sqq, Virgil may be supposed to think especially of Lucretius. He influenced Ovid (see A. Zingerle, on Ovid's relation etc. II p. 12—47) and much more Manilius (see 248, 5). The archaists of the first century of the Christian era preferred Lucretius to Virgil (Tac. dial. 23).

3. Lucretius is so firmly convinced of the truth of his doctrine that he looks upon the errors of others with compassion and self-congratulation (II 9—13), and he is so certain of the merit of his enterprise that he is engaged on it night and day (II 143. IV 966 sq.) and forgets all the difficulties of his subject (I 413 sqq. 921) and the treatment of it in Latin (propter egestatem patrii sermonis I 140. 832. III 261), in the hope of renown (I 922) which he claims primum quod magnis doceo de rebus et artis relligionum (cf. 63 sqq. 84 sqq. II 44, where mortis timores are mentioned) animos nodis exsolvere pergo; deinde quod obscura de re tam lucida pango carmina, musaeo contingens cuncta lepore (I 930—933); and also on account of the novelty of his attempt (I 925—929, cf. II 1023 sqq.) which should be understood only in reference to Roman literature. A certain melancholy pervades his whole system, see e. g. III 870—977 and other passages. J. Reisacker, on the idea of death . . especially in Epicurus and Lucretius. Trier 1862. 4. His warm and noble mind is attested by many touching descriptions of scenes of human life (I 938 sqq. II 1163 sqq. III 907 sqq. V 223 sqq.) and of nature (II 29 sqq. 144 sqq. 352 sqq.). On Lucretius see especially Mommsen R. G. III^2. p. 573—577, and from him J. Mähly, New Swiss Museum 1865, p. 175 sqq.

4. For his system see F. A. Märcker, T. Lucretius Carus, on the Nature of things and the immortality of the soul, Berlin 1851. E. v. Suckau, de Lucr. metaphysica et morali doctrina, Paris 1857. J. W. Braun, Lucr. de atomis doctrina Münster 1857. F. Hildebrandt, Lucr. de primordiis doctrina, Magdeburg 1864. 4. P. Montée, Lucr. considéré comme moraliste, Paris 1861. Fr. Siemering, Quaestionum Lucretianarum Part. I et II, Königsberg 1867 (I de philosophia Epicurea etc. p. 1—23; II de aliorum philosophorum quae apud Lucr. Epicureum occurrunt sententiis etc. p. 23—49). Th. Bindseil, quaestiones lucret., Anclam 1867 4.

On his relations to his sources see A. J. Reisacker, Epicuri de animorum natura doctrina a Lucretio discipulo tractata, Cöln 1855. 4. E. Hallier, Lucr. carm. e fragmentis Empedoclis adumbratum, Jena 1857.

5. His diction is treated of by F. W. Altenburg, de usu antiquae locutionis in Lucr. carmine obviae, Gotha 1857. 4. C. W. F. Proll, de formis antiquis Lucretianis, Breslau 1859. R. Schubert, de Lucretiana verborum formatione, Halle 1865. R. Bouterwek, Lucretianae quaestiones grammaticae et criticae, Halle 1861. Fr. Polle, de artis vocabulis (philosophical terms) quibusdam Lucretianis, Dresden 1866. F. W. Holtze, syntaxis Lucretianae lineamenta, Lips. 1858. 204 pp. C. G. L. Städtler, de sermone Lucret., Jena 1869. 51 pp. G. Kühn, quaest. lucr., Breslau 1869. 64 pp.

6. As to the extent to which Lucretius left his work uncompleted and the care bestowed upon it by its editors opinions differ (see Purmann in Jahn's Jahrb. 67 p. 658 sqq. Polle, Philol. XXV p. 503 sq.), but there is no doubt as to the fact itself or the greater polish of the first three books when compared with the others.

L. Grasberger, de Lucr. carmine, München 1856. E. Heine, de Lucr. carm. de r. n., Halle 1865. 4.

7. On Lucretius and his work see Bayle dictionnaire s. v. Additions to Sulzer VII p. 310— 336. Bruner, de carmine didasc. (Helsingfors 1840. 4.) p. 20—41. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. IV (1845.) p. 1195—1198. C. Martha, Revue des deux mondes, March 1863, p. 187—215. J. Mähly, New Swiss Museum V 1865 p. 167—188. Fr. Polle, on Lucretius since Lachmann and Bernays, Philologus XXV p. 489—530. XXVI p. 290—345. 524—565.

8. Ancient commentators Valerius Probus (whom see). Hieronym. in Ruf. I (II p. 472 Vall.): puto quod puer legeris Aspri .. commentarios .. et aliorum in alios, Plautum videlicet, Lucretium, Flaccum etc. See J. Steup, de Probis p. 81 sq. note 2. In the middle ages Lucretius appears to have been completely forgotten: J. Jessen, Philol. XXX p. 236—238.

9. All the mss. of Lucretius may be traced back to an archetype of the fourth or fifth century in capitals and without separate division of words (Lachm. on Lucr. p. 3; cf. Philol. XXV p. 528—530). After the ninth century this was propagated in three copies from which the three classes of our mss. are descended (Lachm. p. 4—11). The first

is solely represented by the oblongus (or Leidensis 1): see E. Göbel, Rh. Mus. XV p. 401—418. The first class consists of the italici (eight Laurentiani, among which n. 30 is Niccoli's copy, six Vatican mss., and also a Cambridge ms.), all of them descended from the ms. brought by Poggio from Germany, a ms. very much like the oblongus. See Philol. XXV p. 517 sq. A greatly interpolated representative of this class may be found in the Munich ms. on parchment once in the possession of P. Victorius (hence called codex Victorianus) and the corrections in which are probably due to Pontanus' pupil, Marullus († 1500): see L. Spengel, Munich News XXXIII (1851) p. 771 sqq. W. Christ, quaest. Lucr. München 1855. E. Göbel, quaest. Lucr. crit., Salzburg 1857. 4. Rhein. Mus. XII p. 453 sq. De cod. Victor. by H. Sauppe (Götti. 1864. 4.) and Bouterwek (Halle 1865. 4.). Munro p. 7—15. 27. Fr. Polle, Philologus XXV p. 518—528. The third class consists of the quadratus (Leid. 2) and two fragments, the (eight) Schedae Havnienses and the (ten) Schedae Vindobonenses; see R. J. F. Henrichsen, de fragm. Gottorpiensi Lucr., Eutin 1846. E. Göbel, Rh. Mus. XII. p. 449 sqq.

10. On the basis of these mss., but with the admixture of several unjustifiable linguistic assumptions (Philol. XXVI p. 294—298) the text of Lucretius was revised by Lachmann (1850) who was mainly followed by Bernays (1852). The most important revision of the text, after Lachmann, is Munro's edition (1864, 1866.), which at the same time contains the best exegetical commentary on the poem. There are numerous critical contributions in the shape of Quaestiones Lucretianae by H. Purmann (Breslau 1844. Lauban 1858. 4. 1860. 4.), J. Siebelis (Lips. 1844), J. Reisacker (Bonn 1847), Oppenrieder (Augsburg 1848), H. Lotze (Philologus VII 1852 p. 696—732), W. Christ (München 1855), Th. Bindseil (Anclam 1867. 4.), J. Jessen (Göttingen 1868, p. 10—40); Observationes Lucretianae by P. E. Göbel (Bonn 1854), and various treatises by J. N. Madvig (Opusc. I p. 305—322), J. Bernays (Rh. Mus. V p. 533—587; VIII p. 159 sq.), H. Purmann (Naumburg 1849. 4.), F. W. Altenburg (Schleusingen 1845. 4.), J. Roos (Gröningen 1847), Th. Bergk (Jahn's Jahrbb. 67, p. 315—330. 83, p. 316—334. 495—509. 617—638), C. Winckelmann (Salzwedel 1857. 4.), Fr. Susemihl and A. Brieger (Philologus XIV p. 550—567. XXIII p. 455—472. 623—643. XXIV p. 422—453. XXV p. 67—91. XXVII p. 28—57), L. Müller (ibid. XV p. 157—162), Th. Bindseil (Halle 1865), E. Polle (Philologus XXV p. 269—283) and others. See the list given by F. Polle, ibid. XXVI p. 298—345, 524 sqq.

11. Editions (cf. Munro I p. 3—23). Ed. princeps s. l. et a. (probably Brix. 1473) fol. Aldina I (1500. 4.) cura H. Avancii; cum comm. I. B. Pii, Bonon. 1511 fol. Iuntina (cura P. Candidi), Flor. 1512. Cum comm. D. Lambini, Paris 1564. 4. 1570. 4. Francof. 1583. 8. and often. Cum collectan. Ob. Gifanii, Antverp. 1566. 8. and often. Cum notis Th. Creech, Oxon. 1695, the last times 1807. 1818. 1835. Cum notis varr. ed. S. Havercamp, Lugd. B. 1725. 4. 2 vols. Ed. G. Wakefield,

Lond. 1796. 4. 3 voll. Glasg. 1813. 8. 4 voll. (cf. Madvig l. l. p. 306 sq.). Ed. H. C. A. Eichstaedt, Lips. 1801. Vol. I (Prolegg., text, Index). Ed. A. Forbiger, Lips. 1828. Rec. et ėmend. C. Lachmann, cum comm., 2 vols., Berlin 1850. 1853—1855. 1860—1866. Ed. J. Bernays; Lips. 1852. With notes by H. A. J. Munro, Cambridge 1760. ed. II 1866; Vol. II (translation in prose) 1865. Text by Munro (recogn.), Cambridge 1860. 1864.

202. The younger generation, whose prime falls into the stormy time of the Civil War between Pompey and Caesar, and who were obliged to share these broils, thereby received a passionate and excited character in life as well as in literature. Imbued with the results of mental culture and Greek refinement, conscious moreover of their own power, these men courageously tried new paths and even endeavoured to equal the Greeks themselves in literature. Sallust in history and Catullus in poetry, show how successful these attempts were, both being men of pretty much the same age and the most prominent of a considerable number: in poetry, Varro Atacinus and Licinius Calvus nearly equalled Catullus; in another branch we should mention the Syrian Publilius; in prose, M. and D. Brutus, Caelius Rufus, Cornificius, Curio, Furnius, and many others distinguished themselves both as writers and speakers. Even a lady, Hortensia, appears among the orators, and other ladies, like Catullus' Lesbia, wrote poems. All these men studied nearly the same style of eloquence, a certain naturalness, though sometimes they pursued it so intentionally as to become artificial by the excess of it. In poetry, they imitated the Alexandrine poets, sometimes to their very subjects. Epic poems on mythological subjects were written by Valerius Cato (Diana), Catullus (Epithalam. Pelei), Calvus (on Io), Cinna (Zmyrna), Cornificius (Glaucus), Caecilius (Cybele); epithalamia and hymenaeal poems by Catullus, Calvus and Ticidas. It was in equal harmony with Alexandrine poetry and with the loose manners of the time and these circles, that almost each one of these poets should write erotic poetry. In politics, however, they were divided, though all influenced by politics. Just as a stirring time produced an entire literature of its own, poetry followed the men and affairs of the day with its productions; historical composition showed itself under the influence of politics from beginning to end, and eloquence even then began to feel

the deteriorating influence of the period by being stinted in its ordinary range of subjects.

1. On the jurists Trebatius Testa and A. Cascellius see above 199, 3 and 4.

2. Anonymous epigrams in praise of Caesar and more especially his expedition to Britain from the cod. Voss. 86 in the Latin Anthology, 419—426 R. More below 214, 4.

3. In the following account the less significant features of this epoch are so distributed between its two greatest men, that Sallust is followed by the Caesarian writers Q. Tubero, Alfenus Varus und C. Matius; then we mention the orators, writers of the day and other prose-writers, most of whom belong to the opposite side, while Catullus and the other poets form the conclusion and transition to the Augustan period.

203. C. Sallustius Crispus of Amiternum (a. 667—720) devoted the last years of his eventful life to historical composition. At first he wrote a monograph on the conspiracy of Catiline, more from literary sources than the original documents, with a manifest attempt at impartiality, though not without disguising his sympathy with Caesar. His treatment is pragmatical, psychological and rhetorical, but not sufficiently accurate in point of chronology. His Iugurtha is more evenly planned and superior in style: it contains an objective description of the lowest decay of Roman oligarchy faithfully drawn from authentic sources. His last work were five books of Historiae, commencing with the year of Sulla's death (676) and carried down to 687, though they were perhaps never completed. His last work was planned in the same way as the two smaller treatises, but we have only fragments of it. Owing to a compilation of all the orations and letters occurring in Sallust's work made for rhetorical purposes in the second century of the Christian era, four speeches and two letters have been preserved from the wreck of the Historiae. Two letters ad Caesarem senem de republica and the invectiva Sallusti in Ciceronem (to which there is also Ciceronis in Sallustium responsio) are wrongly ascribed to Sallust.

1. The spelling Sallustius has the best authorities in its favour and is in accordance with etymology. — Jerome on Euseb. chr. ad a Abr. 1930 = Ol. 173, 2 = 667 = 87 B. Ch. (in cod. Freher. ad 1931 = 668): Sallustius Crispus scriptor historicus in Sabinis Amiterni

nascitur; and ad 1981 = Ol. 186, 1: Sallustius diem obiit quadriennio ante actiacum bellum. Chron. pasch. I p. 347: . . *ὑπάτων Μαρίου τὸ ζ' καὶ Κίννα τὸ β'* (668 a.) *Σαλούστιος ἐγεννήθη καλάνδαις ὀκτωβρίαις*, and p. 359: *Σαλούστιος ἀπέθανε πρὸ τριῶν ἰδῶν μαΐων*. Gell. XVII 18: M. Varro . . in libro quem [in]scripsit „Pius aut de pace" C. Sallustium scriptorem seriae illius et severae orationis, in cuius historia notiones censorias fieri atque exerceri videmus, in adulterio deprehensum ab Annio Milone loris bene caesum dicit et cum dedisset pecuniam dimissum. Cf. Porph. on Hor. S. I 2, 41. Serv. Ae. VI 612. Respons. 5. He was trib. pl. 702 (Ascon. Mil. p. 38 Or.). The Censors of a. 704, as it seems, for political reasons, removed him from the Senate (Resp. 6. Dio XL 63); Caesar restored him to it a. 705 by appointing him to a quaestura (Resp. 6, cf. 8) and (707?) to a praetura; through Caesar he became proconsul of Africa, a. 708; see Bell. Afr. 8. 34. 97. In that position he collected great riches; see Resp. 7. Dio XLIII 9. He was the possessor of the horti Sallustiani.

2. Catilina (bellum Catilinarium, de coniuratione Catilinae), the first fruit of Sallust's leisure (Cat. 4, 11 sqq.) written not before 711 and probably published in 712. Several historical and chronological inaccuracies in it have been pointed out by W. Drumann and E. Hagen; cf. H. Wirz, Catiline's and Cicero's candidatures (Zurich 1864) p. 33 sqq. Mommsen in the Hermes I (1866) p. 436 sq. Cicero is treated with much tact, in being neither overpraised nor blamed; but the writer's personal partiality for Caesar appears in some places. There are many reflections: following the example of Greek writers C. Sallustius in bello iugurthino et Catilinae nihil ad historiam pertinentibus principiis orsus est (Quintil. III 8, 9). R. Dietsch, quo tempore quoque consilio Sallustius Catilinam scripserit, Grimma 1856. 4. Hanegraat, de temporum computatione in libro de coniuratione Catilinae, Zutphen 1846. W. M. Pahl, de prooemiis Sallustianis, Tübingen 1859. 4. Friedr. Baur, On some points of chronology in defence of Sallust's Catiline, in Correspondenzblatt für gel. Schulen Würtembergs 1868, p. 189—199. W. Ihne in the Transactions of the philological Congress at Würzburg, Leipzig 1869, p. 105—115.

Editions by J. Ch. W. Dahl (Brunswick 1800), Ch. G. Herzog (Leipzig 1828), Fr. Kritz (ed. illustr., Lips. 1828), G. v. Wieringhen-Borski (ed. ill. Groning. 1831), R. Dietsch (Leipzig 1864). With notes for translation into Greek by Holzer and Rieckher, Stuttg. 1869.

Contributions to the criticism of the work by C. W. Nauck (the Introduction, Königsberg in d. N. 1850. 4.), Kviçala (Ztschr. f. östrr. Gymn. 1863, p. 579—626), Th. Wiedemann (Philologus XXII p. 485—504) and others.

3. Iugurtha (bellum iugurthinum), as it seems, principally from he Memoirs of Sulla, Scaurus and Rutilius, and with occasional use of Sisenna (Jug. 95, 2) and other sources (ib. 17, 7). The work is not reliable in points of geography and ethnography. The political point

of view (ib. 5, 1) predominates, but does not lead the writer into partiality. The speeches of Memmius (31) and Marius (85) are excellent portraitures of political situations. The work concludes with a significant glance at Marius. The plan (introduction, excursuses and speeches) is on the whole the same as in the Catiline; there are even repetitions of phrases occurring there and in the Iugurtha itself; but the single parts are in better proportion to each other. Editions by Ch. G. Herzog (Leipzig 1840), O. Gehlen (Regensburg 1852), O. Eichert (Breslau 1867). R. Dietsch, Obss. criticae in Iug. partem extremam, Grimma 1845. 4. Widmann, de Memmii oratione, Blaubeuren 1867. 4. Mommsen, Hermes I p. 427—430.

4. The Historiae were, as far as the subject is concerned, a continuation of Sisenna's work. The history of Sulla was purposely omitted (Iug. 95, 2). It extended bis senos per annos (Auson. Idyll. IV 61 sqq.). That it opened with a. 676 is quite certain (the first words were res populi rom. M. Lepido Q. Catulo coss. ac deinde militiae et domi gestas composui), nor does anything in the fragments lead us beyond a. 687. Here, too, the author aimed at historical impartiality; see below 204, 2. Owing to the rhetorical selection (altogether 15 speeches and 6 letters from Sallust) we possess 4 speeches (Lepidi, Philippi, Cottae, Macri) and 2 letters (Cn. Pompei, Mithridatis) originally belonging to the Historiae. Of the other fragments should be mentioned the fragmentum Berolinense (discovered by Heine, first edited by G. H. Pertz who took it for a fragment of Livy) which relates to a. 681 and belongs to the second books (cf. H. Jordan, Hermes II p. 81—85), and the fragmenta Vaticana of the fourth book, treating of the war with Spartacus. See Jordan's edition of Sallust p. 111—128 and Hermes, V p. 396—412. The fragments of the Hist. have been collected by J. Th. Kreyssig, 1811—1852, especially by Fr. Kritz (disposita suisque comm. illustrata, Lips. 1853, and newly arranged and explained, Erfurt 1856). Additions in the Rh. Mus. XVIII p. 478 sq. XIX 147 sq. G. Linker, Sall. Hist. prooemium . . restituere tentavit, Marburg 1850. J. G. Schlimmer, hist. rerum gest. in Hist. Sall. libris. Utrecht 1860. The orations and letters of the Hist., rec. et ed. Orelli (Zurich 1830; to which belongs the historia critica eclogarum ex Sall. Hist., (Zurich 1833). See also R. Klotz (Leipzig 1849) and especially H. Jordan, Rh. Mus. XVIII p. 584—593.

5. The two Epistles ad Caesarem (though the first is rather in the shape of a speech) are no doubt of the Imperial period and the productions of rhetorical schools (suasoriae), both unpractical and in imitation of Sallust's diction, besides also in an exaggerated archaic spelling. The second is very prolix and partly contains the same proposals as the first, though without any further connexion with it. They seem to be treatises on the same theme, from different points of view, but (on account of the equality of their disposition, spirit, language and many phrases) of the same age, if not by the same author, which is the opinion of Orelli and Jordan: the latter of whom places him in the

time between the Flavii and Antonini, while Orelli fixes on the age of Fronto and considers Fronto as the author of the collection of the orations and letters of Sallust. See W. Teuffel, in the list of the Tübingen degrees of 1868, p. 13 sq. H. Jordan, de suasoriis ad Caes. senem de rep. inscriptis, Berlin 1868. 32 pp.

6. The Invectiva Sallusti in Ciceronem (which pretends to have been delivered in the Senate) is brief, rude, and openly slanderous. On account of the acerbity with which Cicero's conduct against the Catilinarians is treated it might be by one of that faction (cf. Ascon. p. 95 Or.). Quintilian knew it and accepted it as genuine (XI 1, 24). The Responsio (Ciceronis in Sallustium) is a more prolix declamation, but contains several details credible in themselves and not known from other sources, which might seem to vindicate it to the beginning of the Imperial period. Obscure traces seem to point to a certain Didius (Linker: Epidius) as the author. Dio appears to have made use of it. Cf. Corradi Quaestura p. 85—128, the programs of Ch. G. Herzog (Gera 1844 sqq. 4.) and W. Teuffel l. l. (1868) p. 14 sq.

7. Old commentators. Aemilius Asper (Lyd. de magistr. III 8: *Αἰμίλιος ἐν τῷ ὑπομνήματι τῶν Σαλλουστίου ἱστοριῶν.* Charis. p 216, 28 K.: Asper commentario Sallustii Historiarum I) and Statilius Maximus (Charis. p. 196, 4 K.). Suidas v. *Ζηνόβιος: Ζηνόβιος σοφιστὴς παιδεύσας ἐπὶ Ἁδριάνου Καίσαρος ἔγραψε . . μετάφρασιν ἑλληνικῶς τῶν Ἱστοριῶν Σαλουστίου τοῦ ῥωμαϊκοῦ ἱστορικοῦ τῶν καλουμένων αὐτοῦ Βελῶν* (Bella). An anonymous commentator on the Catiline is mentioned by Suringar, hist. schol. I p. 254.

8. Manuscripts. The orations and letters (even those ad Caesarem) are contained in Vatic. 3864 saec. IX. The mss. of the Bella are divided into two classes. The older (most of saec. X) gives a better text, but has a gap in Iug. 103, 2 to 112, 3. Its best representative is Paris. Sorb. nr. 500, saec. IX—X. The later mss. are greatly interpolated, but fill up the gap of the other class: the best of them is Monac. saec. XI. In some mss. of the first class the missing chapters are added at the end; some of the second class have in some places words wanting in others and genuine in spite of that omission. See the differing views as to the relations of these two classes to each other, of C. L. Roth (Rh. Mus. IX p. 129—135, and p. 630 sq.), R. Dietsch in his ed. of 1859, and E. Wölfflin (Philol. XVII p. 154—159. 519—548 and against him E. Brentano, de C. Sallustii Crispi codicibus recensendis, Frankfort 1864 p. 2 sqq.), H. Jordan (on Vat. 3864, in the Hermes I p. 231—240; on the cod. Nazarianus, ib. p. 240 sqq.). Other contributions from mss. will be found in Thorlacius, III codd. pergam. descr., Copenhagen 1815. 4. Birnbaum, spec. lectt. Sall. e codd. Trevirens., Trier 1822. 4. Bojesen, de duobus codd. Sall. Havniensibus, Copenh. 1847. Gutenäcker, Variae lectt. ex III codd. mss. Würzburg 1837. 1839. 4. H. Alanus, lectiones codd. trium, Dublin 1865. A collation of a ms. at Barcelona, Philologus XIV p. 759 sq. J. C. Wirz, de

fide atque auctoritate codicis Sall. qui Parisiis in Bibl. imp. n. 1576 asservatur, Aarau 1867. 4. A. Eussner, Philologus XXV p. 343 sq. and in the Würzburg Festgruss (1868) p. 159 sqq. 184 sqq.

9. Editions. Ed. princeps s. l. (Ven.) 1470. 4. Rom. 1490. 4. Venet. Ald. 1509. 8. Paris. 1509. 4. (by Ascensius). Basle 1538. 8. (by Glareanus). Ed. L. Carrio, Antv. 1573. 1580. Jan. Gruter, Francf. 1607. J. Wasse, Cantabr. 1710. 4. E rec. et c. notis G. Cortii, Lips. 1724. 4. (a reprint, Lips. 1825 sqq.). Rec. et cum notis varr. ed. S. Havercamp, Haag 1742. 2 voll. 4. (a reprint by Frotscher, Lips. 1828 sq.). By G. Ch. Harles (Nürnb. 1778. 1797). in the Bipont Series (1779. 1796), by H. Kunhardt (Lübeck 1809), O. M. Müller (Leipzig and Züllichau 1821), W. Lange (Halle 1815. 1824. 1833), F. D. Gerlach (recogn., varr. lectt., commentarios atque indices adiecit, 3 voll. 4. Basle 1823. 1827. 1831; denuo rec. atque ed., Basle 1832; rec., adnot. crit., indicibus hist. et gramm. instruxit; Vol. I. Basle 1852), C. H. Frotscher (Lips. 1825 sqq. 3 voll. 8.), F. Kritz (ad fid. codd. rec. c. comm., Lips. 1828. 1834 sq. 2 voll. with Ind., the fragments 1853; recogn. et succincta annot. illustr., Lips. 1856), E. W. Fabri (with German notes, Nürnberg 1831 sq. sec. ed. 1845), C. H. Weise (Lips. 1831), H. E. Allen (London 1832), J. C. Orelli (Zürich 1840 and 1853), R. Dietsch (Lips. 1843. 1846; a glare edition in two voll., Lips. 1859; with German notes, I. Leipzig 1864), A. Hedner (notis ill., Orebro 1848), Tho. Keightley (with notes and excursus, London 1848), R. Jacobs (Leipzig 1852. 4th edition Berlin 1864), F. W. Hinzpeter (with German notes, Bielefeld 1867). Texts by E. F. Bojesen (Copenh. 1837. 1852), G. Linker (Wien 1855), Gerlach (Lips., Tauchn., 1856), R. Dietsch (Bibliotheca Teubner., ed. V. 1867), and especially H. Jordan with a brief adnot. critica, Berolin. 1866.

10. Critical and exegetical treatises. G. St. Lechner, Observationes in nonnullos Sall. locos, Hof 1828. 4. Selling, lectionum Sall. decades III., Augsburg 1831. 4.; Emendationes Sall., Ansbach 1835. 4. G. Linker, Emendations in Sallust, Vienna 1855 (Trans. of the Academy). F. Hitzig in the Monthly Publications of the Literary Society at Zurich 1856, number 10. G. Wagner, disp. de locis quibusdam Sall., Ratibor 1861. 4. F. Gründel, quaestiones Sallustianae, Königsberg 1861. H. Jordan, in the Hermes I (1866) p. 229—250. [See W. Wagner, Trans. of the Phil. Society in London, 1867, p. 241—245. Rh. Mus. XXIII 699 sqq.] A. Eussner, im Würzburger Festgruss (1868) p. 158—194, and Exercitationes Sall., Würzburg 1868.

204. Sallust was the first Roman historian who wrote in obedience to fixed rules. Leaving the tracks of his Roman predecessors, he found his models among the Greeks, where he was especially interested and influenced by Thucydides. He followed the Greek historian in selecting subjects taken from the history of his own time. Though he did not succeed in reaching the elevated station, the penetrating criticism

and objective tone of his model, he may be allowed to rival Thucydides in truthfulness and impartiality. Even in the outward arrangement of his work he reminds the reader of Thucydides, especially in his introductory remarks and the speeches which he intersperses, and which serve to characterise the whole position of affairs and the actors of the events. There is, however, a predominance of the rhetorical element which frequently interferes with the historical style, and we are struck chiefly with the abundance of reflexions and a certain indifference to facts when compared with their psychological interest. Sallust excels in delineations of character, and there, as well as in the great care bestowed upon formal polish, he had no predecessor among his countrymen. Like Thucydides, though perhaps not to the same extent, Sallust was no fast writer and took great pains with his works. Like his great model, he endeavours to be brief, sententious and concise, even so as to become obscure and contorted; in many details of his diction he purposely deviated from the usage of his time, and moulded his style in imitation of Greek analogies and of archaic writers, especially Cato the Elder. His archaic diction and rhetorical colouring gained Sallust great authority in the time of Fronto, and again at the close of the fourth and in the fifth century of the Christian era.

1. Primus romana Crispus in historia, Martial. XIV 191. Quintil. II 5, 19: Livium a pueris magis (legi velim) quam Sallustium, et hic historiae maior est auctor, ad quem tamen intellegendum iam profectu opus sit. — Vellej. II 36, 2: aemulum Thucydidis Sallustium. Quintil. X 1, 101: nec opponere Thucydidi Sallustium verear. Sen. Rhet. Suas. p. 35. 11 sq. Bu.: hoc (a parentation in relating the death of an eminent person) semel aut iterum a Thucydide factum, item in paucissimis personis usurpatum a Sallustio. It should be observed that Sallust chose Thucydides for his pattern among the Greek historians, but not only also that his imitation could not be succeful in the most important. points. Sallust held opposite political views and was as decided an adherent of the Imperial and democratic party, as Thucydides was of the Aristocracy; gravity and dignity are, moreover, natural to Thucydides, and artificially acquired by Sallust. It has often been remarked that Sallust's tone is at variance with the facts of his life: in ancient times with great vehemence by Lenaeus, who tanto amore erga patroni (Cn. Pompey's) memoriam exstitit ut Sallustium historicum, quod eum oris probi, animo inverecundo (i. e. as a hypocrite) scripsisset, acerbissima satura laceraverit, lastaurum et lurchonem et nebulonem popinonemque appellans et vita scriptisque monstrosum, praeterea

priscorum Catonis verborum ineruditissimum furem (Sueton. gramm. 15). But even such an honest man as Gellius (above 193, 1) remarks that actions like those in Milo's house can be scarcely thought possible from the austere tone of Sallust's works: Macrobius (Sat. II 9 = III 13, 9) hence calls Sallust gravissimus alienae luxuriae obiurgator et censor. Symmachus also (Epist. V 68) calls him scriptor stilo tantum probandus; nam morum eius damna non sinunt ut ab illo agendae vitae petatur auctoritas. Lactantius (Inst. D. II 12, p. 143 sq. Bip.): quod quidem non fugit hominem nequam Sallustium, qui ait: nostra omnis vis etc., Cat. 1, 2. recte, si ita vixisset ut locutus est. servivit enim foedissimis voluptatibus suamque ipse sententiam vitae pravitate dissolvit-judges unjustly, as Sallust's moral sayings were posterior to his immoral life, and instead of being refuted by them, might rather be considered as the result of better experience and subsequent repentance. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of this change of mind, though it was somewhat late, when Sallust had already secured the fruits of his past life, and could look forward to nothing else but literary renown. But his past life may have left to him a certain pessimism betrayed by the historian, a disposition to trace the acts of others to bad motives, a kind of dissatisfied misanthropy. See also J. W. Löbell, on Sallust's character. Breslau 1818.

2. His veracity. Catil. 4, 2: statui res gestas populi rom. . . perscribere, eo magis quod mihi a spe, metu, partibus reip. animus liber erat. 4, 3 and 18, 1: quam verissume potero. Hist. I 6: neque me divorsa pars in civilibus armis movit a vero. Hence Augustin. Civ. dei I 5: Sallustius, nobilitatae veritatis historicus. Isidor. Orig. XIII 21, 10: Sallustius, auctor certissimus. cf. Avien. ora marit. 32 sqq. Sallust's sober and free thought made him silent on the subject of the miracles and wonders mentioned by Livy.

3. On his prooemia see above 203, 2. Among the letters occurring in Sallust that of Lentulus to Catiline (Cat. 44) is historical (cf. Cic. Catil. III 5, 12), and the same may be presumed of those of Catiline (c. 35) and of Pompey to the senate. All the speeches in Sallust are impressive and powerful and far more adapted to the peculiar character of the speaker than those in Livy. Yet they are not authentic. Catiline's address to his companions may be shown from Cic. p. Muren. 25 and Plut. Cic. 14 to have been different; nor does anything of what Cic. ad Attic. XII 21 (cf. p. Sest. 28, 61. Vellej. II 35, 3 sq. Plut. Cato min. 23) alleges from Cato's speech in the Senate, occur in the one attributed to Cato by Sallust. Hence it appears that also the other speeches should be looked upon as such compositions as Thucydides I 22 declares his own to be. Those of Sallust, however, possess a greater rhetorical effect and art than those of the Athenian writer. Sallust's rhetorical training is also attested by Fronto Epist. II 1, p. 123 Naber: Ventidius ille, postqum Parthos fudit fugavitque (a. 716 V. C.), ad victoriam suam praedicandam orationem a. G. Sallustio mutuatus est. Seneca rhetor, indeed, says Contr. III praef. 8, p. 361, 15 sq.:

orationes Sallustii in honorem historiarum leguntur, but this is the one-sided judgment of a scholastic rhetor who could discover too little of his unpractical figures in the energetic speeches of our historian. On the other hand, Licinianus' judgment is perverse at least as far as the reason goes which he adduces for it (p. 42 sq. ed. Bonnensium): Sallustium non ut historicum puto sed oratorem legendum. nam et tempora reprehendit sua et delicta carpit et contiones inserit et dat in censum loca, montes, flumina et hoc genus amoena et culta et comparat disserendo. According to Justin. XXXVIII 3, 11 Pompeius Trogus . . in Livio et in Sallustio reprehendit quod contiones directas pro sua oratione operi suo inserendo historiae modum excesserint, in which he was no doubt right, judging from the views of objective historiography, though we should not like to lose these speeches as rhetorical masterpieces.

4. Opinions of antiquity concerning Sallust's diction. Ateius exhorted Asinius Pollio (ut) vitet maxime obscuritatem Sallustii et audaciam in translationibus (Suet. gramm. 10 extr.). On the latter quality see Quintil. IX 3, 12 sq. Sen. Controv. IX p. 249, 16 sq. Bu. Gell. X 26, 1 sqq. — Gell. N. A. IV 15, 1: elegantia orationis Sallustii verborumque fingendi et novandi studium (cf. I 15, 18: novatori verborum Sallustio; ib. VI 17, 8. X 21, 2) cum multa prorsus invidia fuit, multique non mediocri ingenio viri conati sunt reprehendere pleraque et obtrectare. in quibus plura inscite aut maligne vellicant. cf. X 26, 1 sqq. Quintil. X 3, 8: sic (slowly) scripsisse Sallustium accepimus, et sane manifestus est etiam ex opere ipso labor.

His brevity. Sen. Controv. IX p. 249, 9 sqq. (cf. p. 433, 12 sqq.) Bu.: cum sit praecipua in Thucydide virtus brevitas, hac eum Sallustius vicit et in suis illum castris cecidit. . . ex Sallusti sententia nihil demi sine detrimento sensus potest. L. Sen. Epist. XIX 5 (= 114) 17: Sallustio vigente amputatae sententiae et verba ante exspectatum candentia et obscura brevitas fuere pro cultu. Quintil. IV 2, 45: vitanda est etiam illa Sallustiana, quamquam in ipso virtutis locum obtinet, brevitas et abruptum sermonis genus. X 1, 32: illa Sallustiana brevitas, qua nihil apud aures vacuas atque eruditas potest esse perfectius. 102: immortalem illam Sallustii velocitatem. Gell. III 1, 6: Sallustium, vel subtilissimum brevitatis artificem. Macrob. Sat. V 1, 7: breve (dicendi genus), in quo Sallustius regnat. Stat. Silv. IV 7 extr.: Sallusti brevis. Sidon. Apoll. Paneg. Anth. II 190 sq. XXIII 151. Apulej. apol. 95 (parsimonia).

5. His Grecisms. Quintil. IX 3, 17: ex graeco translata vel Sallustii plurima. Gerlach's Edition III p. 331 sq. Poppo's Thucyd. Vol. VI p. 372—381.

Archaisms, especially terms borrowed from Cato, e. g. (multi mortales, prosapia and others). cf. Lenaeus (above n. 1). Augustus (in Suet. Oct. 86): verbis quae C. Sallustius excerpsit ex Originibus Catonis. Asinius Pollio in libro quo Sallustii scripta reprehendit ut nimia priscorum verborum affectatione oblita (Suet. gramm. 10; see below 197, 1). cf. Gell. X 26, 1: Asinio Pollioni in quadam epistula quam ad

Plancum scripsit et quibusdam aliis C. Sallustii iniquis. An epigram in Quintil. VIII 3, 29: et verba antiqui multum furate Catonis, Crispe, iugurthinae conditor historiae. Fronto Epist. IV 3. p. 62 Naber: M. Porcius eiusque frequens sectator C. Sallustius. cf. ib. II 13. p. 36. Serv. Ae. I 6: Cato in Originibus hoc dicit, cuius auctoritatem Sallustius sequitur (Catil. 6). Thus Iug. 31, 1 = Caton. reliq. p. 27, 1 Jordan. F. Deltour, de Sallustio Catonis imitatore, Paris 1859. Some archaisms are pointed out by Priscian VI 12. p. 707 P. = p. 249, 10 sqq. Htz. (vis as plural), Non. Marc. p. 82 (claritudo instead of claritas) and others. But the archaic character of Sallust extends also to his spelling. cf. Zeitfuchs, de orthographia Sallustiana, Sondershausen 1841. 4. P. Schultze, de archaismis Sallustianis. Halle 1871. 83 pp.

6. The formation and connexion of Sallust's sentences is very simple, sometimes even monotonous, especially by his habit of placing *igitur* at the beginning of a sentence. Sallust repeats some favourite expressions continually. Some are no doubt affected, e. g. paucis tempestatibus (Iug. 96, 1) instead of brevi tempore. The impression of simplicity is chiefly caused by the frequent use of the historic infinitive. In his sentences Sallust is fond of rapid changes of construction, of subject and expression. See the materials collected by Gerlach III p. 307—332. N. Ostling, de elocutione C. Sallustii, Upsala 1862. F. Bussmann, de temporum et modorum apud Sall. usu, Greifswalde 1862. Badstübner, de Sall. dicendi genere, Berlin 1863. 4. A. Laws, de dicendi genere Sall., Rössel 1864. 4.

7. The distinct peculiarities of Sallust both caused opposition and could not fail to attract a period fond of admiring and courting abstruseness. Opposition was made not only by Lenaeus and Asinius Pollio, but also by Livy who was opposed to Sallust in the whole style of his writing. Sen. Controv. IX p. 249, 15 sqq. cf. p. 433 sq. Bu.: T. Livius tam iniquus Sallustio fuit ut hanc ipsam sententiam, et tamquam translatam et tamquam corruptam dum transfertur, obiceret Sallustio. But Tacitus felt akin to Sallust whom he calls (A. III 30) rerum romanarum florentissimus auctor, and it is easy to perceive to what extent he is influenced by Sallust. In the time of Tiberius, Sallust was without taste imitated by Arruntius; see Sen. Ep. 114, 17: L. Arruntius . . qui historias belli punici scripsit, fuit Sallustianus et in illud genus nitens. 18: quae apud Sallustium rara fuerunt, apud hunc crebra sunt et paene continua, nec sine causa: ille enim in haec incidebat (?), at hic illa quaerebat. vides quid sequatur ubi alicui vitium pro exemplo est. The time of Fronto was greatly attracted by such a writer as Sallust who was so highly flavoured with archaisms. We find him frequently mentioned in the correspondence of Fronto and M. Aurelius. We meet repeatedly with the combination of Cato, Sallust and Cicero (p. 93. 105. 149 N.), the rhetorical character of Sallust being mentioned with special emphasis. His antitheses (p. 107. cf. 108 sqq. 162) and his sentences (p. 48 N.) are mentioned with high admiration. Under the influence of the taste of his time and owing to his natural good temper,

Gellius (III 1. IV 15. X 26) takes Sallust's part against his adversaries. In the fourth and fifth centuries Sallust was imitated by Septimius (Dictys), and Pseudo-Hegesippus. Exuperantius may almost be styled a Cento from Sallust. Even so late a writer as Sulpicius Severus is fond of Sallustian turns of expression.

8. General literature on Sallust. J. J. H. Nast, de virtutibus historiae Sallustianae, Stuttgart 1785. 4. = Opusc. lat. II, Tübingen 1821, p. 90—103. O. M. Müller, on C. Sallustius, Züllichau 1817. F. D. Gerlach, on the historian Sallust, Basle 1831 = Historical Essays (Hamburg 1841) p. 286 sqq.; Roman Historians (Stuttgart 1855) p. 103—107; de Sall. vita et scriptis, prefixed to his edition of 1852, p. XIII sqq. Blum, Introduction to Roman History p. 141 sqq. H. Ulrici, Characteristics of ancient Historiography p. 125 sqq. Lerminier, Études sur l'histoire I p. 309 sqq. Dreis, prolegomena in C. Sall. opera, I. Kiel 1837. 4.; on Sallust as historian, Itzehoé 1843. 4. De Gerlache, Études sur Salluste, Brussels 1847; II édition, Brussels 1859. W. Teuffel, in Pauly's Enc. VI 1. p. 696—702 and in the list of the Tübingen Doctors (1868) p. 1—21. R. Dietsch, in the Transactions of the Philological Congress at Stuttgard (Stuttgart 1857. 4.) p. 27—39. Th. Vogel, de Sall. vita, moribus ac scriptis, Mainz 1857. 4.

205. Q. Aelius Tubero wrote a historical work extending to his own time; he was also an orator, but especially esteemed as a writer on Jurisprudence. In point of formal perfection, he was in that very branch surpassed by P. Alfenus Varus of Cremona (Cons. 715). C. Matius, a knight and friend of Caesar and Augustus, took interest in literature and wrote on gastronomy. The jurist C. Aelius Gallus touched upon the department of the grammarians in drawing up a list of legal expressions with explanations.

1. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 46: post hos (Ofilius, Trebatius) quoque (Mommsen: Q.?) Tubero fuit, qui Ofilio operam dedit; fuit autem patricius (primum patronus? the Aelii were Plebeians) et transiit a causis agendis ad ius civile, maxime postquam (end of 708) Q. Ligarium accusavit nec obtinuit apud C. Caesarem. . . Tubero doctissimus quidem habitus est iuris publici et privati et complures utriusque operis libros reliquit; sermone tamen antiquo usus affectavit scribere et ideo parum libri eius grati habentur. The other works of Tubero were also in archaic style. Quintilian had read his accusation of Ligarius (X 1, 23. XI 1, 80 cf. 78. V 13, 20. 31). Gell. XIV 2, 20 mentions among his juridical writings (praecepta Aelii Tuberonis) super officio iudicis, whence probably ib. 7, 13: in libro IX Tuberonem dicere ait (cf. ib. 8, 2). Tubero's views are quoted Dig. XXXII 29, 4. XXXIII 6, 7 pr. (Ofilius, Cascellius, Tubero). 10, 7, 1. 2. P. H. Saaymans Vader, de Q. Aelio Tub. icto eiusque quae in Pandectis exstant fragmentis, Lugd.

B. 1824. 4. He is mentioned as a historian (*Τουβέρων Αἴλιος*, which should not be understood of his father, see above 159, 7) by Dionys. I 80 who calls him *δεινὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπιμελής*; cf. ib. 7 and Liv. IV 23, 1. Tubero lib. XIV Historiarum quoted by Nonius p. 481. His work extended from the oldest time down to at least the beginning of the war between Pompey and Caesar. The citations of it see in Krause p. 325—328, Roth p. 437—439. H. Peter I p. 311—315. and cf. also Suet. Caes. 56. He seems to be the Q. Tubero quoted by Pliny as an authority in b. II and XVIII, (cf. ib. 26, 64). Gell. VI (VII) and XXX. VIII, 9, 11: Aelium quoque Tuberonem libro ad C. Oppium scripto 'occecurrit' dixisse Probus adnotavit. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. I 1 p. 336 sq. nr. 7. H. Peter, hist. I p. CCCLV —CCCLXI.

2. Sueton. Galb. 3: avus (of the Emperor Galba who was born Dec. 24, 751) clarior studiis quam dignitate (non enim egressus praeturae gradum) multiplicem nec incuriosam historiam edidit. Plut. Rom. 17: *ὡς Ἰόβας φησὶ Γάλβαν Σουλπίκιον ἱστορεῖν*. Oros. V 23: fuisse tunc (a. 678) Pompeio XXX milia peditum . . . Galba scribit, Sertorium autem LX m. ped. . . habuisse commemorat.

3. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 44: ex his auditoribus (of Ser. Sulpicius, above 161, 2 sqq.) plurimum auctoritatis habuit Alfenus Varus. . . ex quibus Varus et consul fuit (suff. a. 715 V. C. according to Fasti Biond., see Orelli-Henzen 6438. C. I. lat. I p. 467, V). He is probably identical with Alfenus mentioned by Catullus 30, 1, and the Varus who attended Siron's philosophical lectures together with Virgil (Schol. Veron. on Virg. Ecl. VI 9. Serv. on Ecl. VI 13. Ae. VI 264), and with Alfenus Varus who was Octavianus' legate a. 714 and promised to protect Virgil's estate (Ecl. VI), and with the Alfenus vafer in Hor. S. I 3, 130 sqq. who omni abiecto instrumento artis clausaque taberna yet (potentialiter) sutor erat, on which Porphyrio (p. 72 sq. Hth.): urbane Alphenum Varum Cremonensem deridet, qui abiecto sutrino quod in municipio suo exercuerat Romam petiit magistroque usus Sulpicio icto ad tantam scientiam pervenit ut consulatum gereret et publico funere efferretur. Cf. ib. p. 63 sq.: Alfenus, sutoris filius, qui ita iuris studio intendit ut beneficio artis huius latum clavum sumeret etc. Gellius VII (VI) 5, 1: Alfenus ictus, Ser. Sulpicii discipulus rerumque antiquarum non incuriosus, in libro Digestorum XXXIV°, Coniectaneorum autem II°. On these two titles see L. Mercklin, Philologus XIX p. 653 sq. n. 3. According to the Flor. Index, there were altogether 40 books of his Digest, a collection of responsa, transferred by Aufidius Namusa to his collection (above 161, 5), epitomized by Paulus, and excerpted in its original form as for as the seventh book, and in the Pauline Epitome (as libri Dig. Alfeni a Paulo epitomatorum) in the Pandectae as far as the eighth book. Cf. Hommel, Palingenesia libr. iuris vett. (Lips. 1767) I p. 27—38. Of some importance is the lengthy extract Dig. V 1, 76 as it attests the writer's philosophical training (quod, ut philosophi dicerent, ex particulis minimis consisteremus); other fragments

show him acquainted with Greek, and nearly all are in a simple and easy style. Ev. Otto, P. Alfenus Varus ab iniuriis veterum et recentiorum liberatus, in Thesaur. iur. rom. V p. 1631—1688. S. W. Zimmern, History of Roman private law I 1. p. 295—297. Huschke, Ztschr. f. histor. Rechtswiss. XV p. 187 (who is inclined to change in Pomponius l. l. Alfenus Varus Caius to the agnomen of Catus). W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. I 1 p. 768 sq. nr. 3.

4. C. Matius, born c. 670 V. C., the faithful friend of Caesar, especially fitted by his mild and sober manner to his mediating position, though he did not enter into political factions or public business. He transferred his love for Caesar upon Octavianus and seems to have died as late as a. 750; see Plin. N. H. XII 2, 6, 13: primus C. Matius ex equestri ordine, Divi Augusti amicus, invenit nemora tonsilia intra hos LXXX annos. E. v. Leutsch, Ztschr. f. d. AW. 1834, p. 164—166 (who makes no distinction between C. and Cn. Matius). W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. IV (1845) p. 1643—1645. Cic. ad Fam. VII 15, 2 (a. 701): C. Matii, suavissimi doctissimique hominis. XI 27, 5 sq. (a. 710): ut haec φιλοσοφούμενα scriberem tu me impulisti. . . omnia me tua delectant, sed maxime maxima cum fides in amicitia . . tum lepos, humanitas, litterae. Apollodoros of Pergamum dedicated his Ars (manual of Rhetoric) to him; see Quintil. III 1, 18. His letter to Cicero (ad. fam. XI 28, of a. 710) is a faithful reflection of his noble and elegant mind. A letter addressed to Cicero by Matius and Trebatius together (a. 705) is found ad Att. IX 15 A. His work on gastronomy was probably written under Augustus (above 147, 4), and even this subject attests his innocent nature and love of refined enjoyment of life.

5. Gell. XVI 5, 3: C. Aelius Gallus in libro De significatione verborum quae ad ius civile pertinent secundo (a definition of vestibulum) = Macrob. VI 8, 16 who merely adds vir doctissimus. Dig. L 16, 157: C. Aelius Gallus libro I de verborum quae ad ius civile pertinent significatione (a definition of paries and via). An abbreviated title ap. Serv. Georg. I 264: Aelius Gallus de verbis ad ius civile pertinentibus vallos . . appellat; and Festus p. 218^{b}: postliminium receptum Gallus Aelius in libro primo significationum quae ad ius pertinent ait esse cum qui etc.; p. 273^{a}: reus nunc dicitur qui causam dicit . . at Gallus Aelius libro II significationum verborum quae ad ius pertinent ait: reus est qui etc.; p. 302$_{b}$: saltum Gallus Aelius l. II significationum quae ad ius pertinent ita definit; p. 352^{b}: flumen recte dici ait Aelius Gallus libro II quae ad ius pertinent. The quotations never exceed the second book, and Festus p. 352, 5 M.: (nota)vit Aelius in XII (tabulis) signi(ficare) relates to Aelius Stilo (above 137, 2): see R. Schöll, De legis XII tbb. reliqq. p. 29. Perhaps the arrangement was according to the alphabet. Aelius Gallus or Gallus Aelius is quoted by Festus 19 times besides the quotations already given. This extensive use as well as the combination of nunc and at Gallus Aelius p. 273^{a} show that Gallus' work was used by Verrius Flaccus. Gallus Aelius in Gaius Dig. XXII 1, 19 pr.; C. Aelius in Priscian VIII p. 382, 1

H. C. W. E. Heimbach, C. Aelii Galli Jcti fragmenta rec. et illustr., Lips. 1823. Ph. E. Huschke, iurisprud. anteiust. (Lips. 1861) p. 28—32 = p. 29—33 (1867). W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. I 1 p. 337, nr. 1.

206. Among the other adherents of Caesar, literature was studied and patronised by several men who may be mentioned either as orators or writers of letters still extant: e. g. the talented, but dissipated C. Scribonius Curio (trib. pleb. 704), Q. Cornificius, the triumvir M. Antony (671—724), and L. Balbus. Men of wavering political opinions were the clever M. Caelius Rufus and the unprincipled L. Munatius Plancus (Cons. 712). C. Furnius, who was legate to the latter for a long time, was also an orator, and likewise the young L. Sempronius Atratinus (Cons. 720), Q. Volusius, Annius Cimber, and even by Hortensia there was in the first century of the Christian era a published speech in existence.

1. Vellei. II 48, 3: C. Curio trib. pl. (704, † 705), . . vir nobilis, eloquens, audax, suae alienaeque et fortunae et pudicitiae prodigus, homo ingeniosissime nequam et facundus malo publico, cuius cupiditatibus vel libidinibus neque opes ullae neque voluptates sufficere possent. Cf. A. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. VI 1 p. 880 sq. nr. 11. His character as an orator is given by Cic. Brut. 81, 280: ita facile soluteque verbis volvebat satis interdum acutas, crebras quidem certe sententias ut nihil posset ornatius esse, nihil expeditius. atque hic parum a magistris institutus naturam habuit admirabilem ad dicendum; industriam non sum expertus; studium certe fuit. There were speeches by him in existence in the time of Tacitus; see dial. 37 (above 158, 3). Cf. Meyer, orat. rom.[2] p. 481—484. Letters from Cicero to him ad fam. II 1—7 (of a. 701 and 703).

2. Jerome on Eus. Chron. a. Abr. 1976 = Ol. 184, 4 = 713 V. C.: Cornificius poeta a militibus desertus interiit. . . huius soror Cornificia, cuius insignia exstant epigrammata. Chronological reasons oblige us to consider him as Q. Cornificius, the quaestor of Caesar who fell in Africa fighting against T. Sextius, propraetor 706: hs was also on friendly terms with Cicero who addressed to him ad fam. XII 17—30, in 709—711: see W. Drumann, Hist. of Rome II p. 617—621. Haakh in Pauly's Encyclop. II p. 710, n. 3: Cicero somewhat pointedly (ib. 18, 1) places him among the magni oratores and (ib. 17, 2) recommends his Orator to his kind reception: in quo saepe suspicatus sum te ab iudicio nostro, sic scilicet ut doctum hominem ab non indocto, paullulum dissidere. ib. 20: me amabis et scripto aliquo lacesses. He is no doubt identical with the poetical friend of Catullus (c. 38), who wrote erotic poems (leve Cornifici . . opus, Ovid. Trist. II 436), whence a hendecasyllabic line in Macrob. VI.4, 12 and a fragment of dactylic metre ib. 5, 13 (Cornificius in Glauco). Cf. Schwabe, Quaest. Catull. p. 298—300.

It is doubtful whether Cornificius in primo de etymis deorum (Prisc. VI p. 711 P. = 257, 6 Htz.) should be understood of him: from this Macrobius I 9, 11 (Cornificius Etymorum libro tertio), 17, 62. 17, 9. 33. 23, 2 quotes curious derivations of the names of gods and a citation of Cic. D. N. Other quotations in Festus p. 123. 194. 282 and in other places in Servius and Lactantius etc. It is incomprehensible how Cornificius managed to find time for these works in Syria and Africa, during the years 709 and 713; and perhaps these writings should rather be attributed to a grammarian of the same name in the Augustan period. See Bergk, Marburg Ind. lect. aest. 1843. 4, and on the other side J. Becker, Cornificius Longus and Cornificius Gallus, Ztschr. f. AW. 1847, n. 133 sq. p. 1060 sqq.

3. The triumvir M. Antony, see Drumann Hist. of Rome I p. 64—517. Pauly's Enc. I 1 p. 1174—1180. Possessing a defective education, he often got in his speeches into a false kind of pathos and became turgid, obscure and faulty (Suet. Aug. 86: M. Antonium . . ea scribentem quae mirentur potius homines quam intellegant; cf. Cic. Phil. III 9. XIII 10 sq. ad Att. X 8 sq. XIV 3). It was perhaps too much to call him hence an adherent of the Asiatic school (Plut. Ant. 2. 43 cf. Suet. l. l.). His letters to Cicero of a. 705 (ad Att. X 8 A. 10, 2) and 710 (XIV 13 A) are in a natural style. Plin. N. H. XIV 22, 148: M. Antonio. is enim . . avidissime adprehenderat hanc palmam (capability of drinking), edito etiam volumine de sua ebrietate. . . exiguo tempore ante proelium actiacum id volumen evomuit. To this as well as to his correspondence with Octavian (specimens of which are given by Suetonius, e. g. Aug. 69), Ovid relates ex Ponto I 1, 23: Antoni scripta leguntur.

4. Asinius Pollio writes to Cicero (ap. fam. X 32, 3) a. 711: Balbus quaestor . . ludis praetextam de suo itinere (a. 705) ad L. Lentulum procos. sollicitandum (to get him to leave Pompey and return to Rome, ad Att. VIII 9, 4. 11, 6. 15 A, 2. IX 6, 1. V [illegible] II 5[illegible], 3) posuit. et quidem cum ageretur flevit, memoria rerum gestarum commotus. ib. 5: praetextam si voles legere, Gallum Cornelium, familiarem meum, poscito. See Welcker, on Greek Tragedies p. 1402. This Balbus is the one called Balbus minor, to distinguish him from his uncle (above 184, 2), L. Cornelius P. f. Balbus, whose life extended much into the Augustan period (he certainly was living 741) and who triumphed a. 735 as Proconsul ex Africa, see W. Drumann, Hist. of Rome II p. 608—610. A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. II p. 694 sq. nr. 3. According to Vellei. l. l. ad pontificatum adsurrexit and had a literary turn, whence it is not impossible that he is the Cornelius Balbus quoted by Serv. Ae. IV 127 on hymenaeus and to whom Macrob. relates III 6, 26: Cornelius Balbus *Ἐξηγητικῶν* libro XVIII°.

5. M. Caelius M. f. Rufus. Plin. N. H. VII 49, 165: C. Mari Con. Carbone III cos. (a. 672=82) a. d. V Kal. Iunias (May 28) M. Caelius Rufus et C. Licinius Calvus eadem die geniti sunt, oratores quidem ambo, sed tam dispari eventu. Nipperdey, Rhein. Mus. XIX p. 289—

291, opposes the fact that they cannot be of the same age to judge from the manner in which Cicero speaks of them (Brut. 79, 273. 81, 279 sq.), and that Caelius must be older to judge from his political career (trib. pl. 702, quaestor at least 700, about which time he must have been 30 years old; aed. cur. 704). Instead of Caelius, Curio should perhaps have been mentioned, or Caelius and Calvus may have been born on the same day, but not in the same year, Caelius perhaps 669 (85), Calvus 672 (82), and Pliny confounded the two consulships of Carbo.

6. Caelius belonged long to the party of the Senate and Cicero, and his political views made Cicero lenient towards Caelius' loose morals and luxurious life; he even defended him against some charges brought by Clodia (a. 698, see above 166, 34), whose circles he had frequented for some time. During Cicero's absence in Cilicia (703 sq.) Caelius was his appointed correspondent at Rome: the letters, 17 in number, are collected in the eighth book of Cic. ad fam. Caelius exhibits in them an acute, though somewhat malicious judgment of persons and facts; though he is never quite clear in his own position; the style is lively, funny, and original. See above 171, 2 and 6. Another letter to Cicero ad Att. X 9 A (a. 705). On the outbreak of the Civil War Caelius was obliged by his debts to join the camp of Caesar, who appointed him praetor in 706. As such he intended to introduce tabulae novae, but was deposed and soon afterwards killed. He is probably identical with that Rufus in Catullus (c. 77, cf. 66) who was at first a friend of the poet and whom he afterwards (c. 696) hates as his rival in Clodia's love. Drumann Hist. of Rome II p. 411—422. A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. II p. 477—480, nr. 7. G. Boissier, Caelius et la jeunesse romaine au temps de César, Revue des deux mondes XLIX (1864) p. 41 sqq.

7. On his oratorical power Cic. Brut. 79, 273: splendida et grandis et eadem inprimis faceta et perurbana . . oratio. graves eius contiones aliquot fuerunt (also de aquis, Frontin. aq. 76), acres accusationes tres (directed against C. Antonius 695, L. Sempronius Atratinus the father 698, Q. Pompeius Rufus 703) . . defensiones (especially 698 pro se against Atratinus, also pro Saufeio 702 and pro M. Servilio 703) . . sane tolerabiles. Hence Quintil. VI 3, 69. X 1, 115; asperitas Caelii ib. X 2, 25 cf. Tac. dial. 18. 21. 25 (amarior). He seems to have followed the Atticists in preference to Cicero's style, though Cicero had taught him the principles of rhetoric (p. Cael. 4, 9). Vellei. II 68, 1: M. Caelius, vir eloquio animoque Curioni (n. 1) simillimus, sed in utroque perfectior, nec minus ingeniose nequam. Sen. de ira III 8, 6: Caelium oratorem fuisse iracundissimum constat. Quintilian, Pliny (Ep. I 20, 4), and Tacitus (dial. 21. 25) were acquainted with his speeches. The fragments and notices relating to them see in Meyer, Orat. rom.[2] p. 460—470. A very lively description of one of his speeches is given by Quintilian IV 2, 123 sq. Witticisms on Clodia ib. VIII 6, 53.

8. L. Munatius Plancus, Caesar's legate and appointed by him Consul in 712; after Caesar's death he went to the side of the Senate, after a little hesitation, then joined Antony and when his star began to set, Octavian, with whom he could remain, owing to his steadfast good fortune. He was censor 732, but generally despised. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. V (1846) p. p. 204—208, nr. 9. C. L. Roth, on M. Pl., in explanation of the inscription on the mausoleum at Gaeta (Mommsen I. R. N. 4089), in the Transactions of the Basle Society of Antiquaries IV, 1852. A. W. de Klerck, Disq. de etc. Utrecht 1855. H. A. Kleijn, de L. et T. Munatiis Plancis, Lugd. Bat. 1857. Suet. rhet. 6 and Plin. N. H. VII 12, 55 call him orator; orator insignis habetur in Jerome ad a. Abr. 1992 = Aug. 19 = 729 V. C.; summa eloquentia Cic. ad fam. X 3, 3 cf. XIII 29, 1. Ascon. in Mil. p. 33 Or. His rhetorical training, but also his vanity, appear from his letters to Cicero (ad fam. X 4. 7—9. 11. 15. 17 sq. 21. 23 sq.) of a. 710 and 711, which are exceedingly well written and abound in cadences, antitheses etc. (verborum et sententiarum gravitas, ib. 12, 1. 16, 1. 19, 1), but the fair words of which often cover a very ambiguous mind.

9. Jerome on Euseb. Chron. a. Abr. 1980 = Aug. 7 = 717 V. C. Furnii pater et filius clari oratores habentur, quorum filius consularis ante patrem moritur. Cf. the Furnii (de populo oratores) in Tac. dial. 21. The father (C. Furnius) was a friend of Cicero; trib. pleb. 704. lieutenant to L. Plancus (n. 8) a. 710 sq. with whom he joined Antony, to whom he adhered until the battle of Actium. He was pardoned by Octavian and a. 725 adlectus inter consulares (Dio LII 42). Cic. ad fam. X 26, 2 (qui alienas causas tam facile discas) attests that he was an orator, and Plut. Anton. 58 even calls him δεινότατος εἰπεῖν Ῥωμαίων. Hor. Sat. I 10, 86: te, candide Furni, seems to relate to him on which Acro: hic historiarum elegantia claruit (subsequently). A trait of egregious flattery towards Octavianus by his son (Cons. 737) is related by Sen. de benef. II 25, 1. Cf. A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. III p. 559 sq. nr. 1 and 2.

10. L. Sempronius Atratinus, through the favour of M. Antony Cons. 720, but even before Actium an adherent of Octavian who made him Procons. of Africa, in which dignity he obtained a triumph IV id. Octobr. 733 (Varr.) ex Africa (fasti tr. ad a.). Jerome on Eus. chron. ad a. Abr. = Ol. 189, 4 = Aug. 23 = 733: Atratinus, qui XVII natus annos Caelium (n. 7) accusaverat (a. 698; he was therefore born 681), clarus inter oratores habetur. ad extremum morborum taedio in balneo voluntate exanimatus heredem reliquit Augustum. Cicero (p. Cael. 1, 2) calls him his necessarius, (ib. 3, 8) and says of him: ornate docteque dixisti; ib. 7, 15 he styles him disertus adolescens. As a speaker in the Senate he is side by side with Messala mentioned by Joseph. b. iud. I 14, 4. Cf. A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. VI 1, p. 973 sq. Nr. 8.

11. Vatinius to Cicero, ad fam. V 10 a, 2 (a. 709): defenditur (Cati-

lius) a Q. Valusio, tuo discipulo. cf. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. VI 2, p. 2745, nr. 5.

12. T. Annius Cimber, Lysidici filius (Cic. Phil. XI 6, 14), became praetor through the assistance of M. Antony (ib. XIII 12, 26), and was affectedly archaic in his speaking and writing; see Quintil. VIII 3, 28 sq. sq. = Vergil. Catal. 2. Octavian ap. Suet. Oct. 86 to M. Antony; tu dubitas Cimberne Annius an Veranius (Verrius?) Flaccus imitandi sint tibi? J. G. Huschke, de Annio Cimbro, Rostock 1824. 4.

13. Caesar's friend, the knight Mamurra of Formiae, † 709, was active in literature, and seems to have been a poet; see Catullus 57, 7 and 105. Schwabe, Quaest. Cat. p. 187 sq. 226.

14. Val. Max. VIII 3, 3: Hortensia, Q. Hortensi (above 158, 1) filia, cum ordo matronarum gravi tributo a triumviris (a. 711) esset oneratus nec quisquam virorum patrocinium eis accommodare auderet, causam feminarum apud triumviros et constanter et feliciter egit; repraesentata enim patris facundia impetravit ut etc. cf. Appian. b. c. IV 32 sq. Quintil. I 1, 6: Hortensiae Q. filiae oratio apud triumviros habita legitur non tantum in sexus honorem.

207. The scholars and teachers had, as such, only a small share in the political struggles. The most important of them was the Greek Ateius Praetextatus, a manysided and fertile writer who styled himself 'Philologus'; besides him may be mentioned Santra who wrote on the History of Literature, Pompey's freedman Lenaeus, Epidius, Sextus Clodius and Gavius Bassus. Statius Sebosus who wrote an account of his travels belongs perhaps to the same period.

1. Sueton. gramm. 10: Ateius Philologus libertinus Athenis est natus. hunc Capito Ateius, notus iuris consultus, inter grammaticos rhetorem, inter rhetores grammaticum fuisse ait. de eodem Asinius Pollio, in libro quo Sallustii scripta reprehendit ut nimia priscorum verborum affectatione oblita, ita tradit; ‚in eam rem adiutorium ei maxime quidem Ateius Praetextatus, nobilis grammaticus latinus, declamantium deinde auditor atque praeceptor, ad summam Philologus ab semet nominatus.' ipse ad Laelium Hermam scripsit se . . audisse Antonium Gniphonem (above 146, 3), . . praecepisse autem multis et claris iuvenibus, in quis Appio quoque et Pulchro Claudiis fratribus (cf. above 186, 10). . . Philologi appellationem assumpsisse videtur quia . . multiplici variaque doctrina censebatur. quod sane ex commentariis eius apparet, quamquam paucissimi exstent. de quorum tamen copia sic altera ad eundem Hermam epistola significat: ‚Hylen nostram . . quam omnis generis coegimus, uti scis, octingentos in libros.' coluit postea familiarissime C. Sallustium et eo defuncto Asinium Pollionem, quos historiam componere aggressos alterum breviario rerum omnium romanarum, ex quibus quas vellet eligeret, instruxit, alterum praeceptis

de ratione scribendi. quo magis miror Asinium credidisse antiqua eum verba et figuras solitum esse colligere Sallustio, cum sibi sciat nil aliud suadere quam ut noto civilique et proprio sermone utatur vitetque maxime obscuritatem Sallustii et audaciam in translationibus. Personal conviction as to the best style did not, however, prevent Ateius from drawing up at order for Sallust a collection of archaic phrases.

2. Suet. gramm. 14: huius (Curtius Nicia, above 187, 4) de Lucilio libros etiam Santra comprobat. Cf. Martial XI 2, 7: salebrosum Santram. Jerome de vir. illustr. (II p. 821 Vall.) praef.: fecerunt hoc idem (i. e. they wrote on the history of literature) . . apud Latinos Varro, Santra, Nepos, Hyginus. Gell. VII 15, 5: ne si Aelii quidem, Cincii et Santrae dicendum ita censuissent. Verrius Flaccus (ap. Fest. p. 277 M.) and Quintilian XII 10, 16 quote Santra with reference to literary questions. Sueton. vit. Terent. 4 (p. 31, 10 Rffsch.): Santra Terentium existimat etc. Festus p. 277 M.: quam rem (on reciniati mimi planipedes) diligenter exsequitur Santra libro II de antiquitate verborum. Schol. Veron. Aen. V 95 (p. 95, 4 sq. K.): Santra de antiquitate verborum libro III ait etc. ad Aen. II 171 (p. 86, 15 K.): ut Santra antiquitatium libris. Non. p. 170, 21: Santra de verborum antiquitate III (or l. II): quod (Naevius' bellum punicum, see above 93, 8) volumen unum nos lectitavimus et postea (in other mss.) invenimus septemfariam divisum. From Santra's Nuntiis Bacchi Nonius quotes four senarii, though not quite complete: see Tragg. latt. reliqq. p. 195 Rb. cf. p. 347 ed. II p. 228; three of which have the correctness of Greek metre. — L. Lersch, Sprachphilosophie III p. 165 sqq. and Ztschr. f. AW. 1839, n. 13 sq. 43. A. E. Egger, lat. serm. vet. reliqq. p. 18—21. L. Preller, Select Essays, p. 377 sqq.

3. Suet. gramm. 15: Lenaeus, Magni Pompei libertus et paene omnium expeditionum comes, defuncto eo filiisque eius (Sextus died last, a. 719) schola se sustentavit . . ac tanto amore erga patroni memoriam exstitit ut Sallustium historicum . . acerbissima satura laceraverit (see above 204, 1). traditur autem puer adhuc Athenis subreptus refugisse in patriam, . . verum . . gratis manumissus. Lenaeus wrote also on pharmacology (Plin. N. H. XXV 3): see above 51, 1.

4. Suet. gramm. 28 = rhet. 4: (M.) Epidius calumnia notatus ludum dicendi aperuit docuitque inter ceteros M. Antonium et Augustum (also Virgil, see below 220, 3). quibus quondam C. Cannutius . . malle [se] respondit Isaurici esse discipulum quam Epidii calumniatoris. hic Epidius ortum se a C. Epidio Nucerino praedicabat. In Plin. N. H. XVII 38, 243 (qualibus ostentis Aristandri apud Graecos volumen scatet, . . apud nos vero C. Epidii commentarii, in quibus arbores locutae quoque reperiuntur) H. Peter (Rhein. Mus. XXII p. 153) prefers thinking of Epicadus (above 144, 1). Cf. above 203, 6.

5. Suet. gramm. 29 = rhet. 5: Sex. Clodius e Sicilia, latinae simul graecaeque eloquentiae professor, male oculatus et dicax par oculorum in amicitia M. Antonii triumviri extrisse (?) se aiebat. . . a quo (M.

Antonio) mox consule (a. 710) ingens etiam congiarium accepit. cf. Cic. Phil. II 17, 43 (rhetorem . . salsum hominem). III 9, 22. ad Att. IV 15, 2 (a. 700): vereor ne lepore te suo detineat diutius rhetor Clodius. Lactant. Inst. I 22, 11: Sex. Clodius in eo libro quem graece scripsit. Arnob. adv. gent. V 18: Sex. Clodius sexto de diis graeco. But the Clodius mentioned by Servius (on Aen. I 176: Clodius commentariorum quarto, cf. ib. 52. II 229) is probably Clodius Tuscus (ib. XII 657). M. Bernays, Theophrastus' work on piety, p. 100 sqq.

6. Of a grammarian Gavius Bassus works are quoted de origine verborum et vocabulorum (Gellius II 4, 3 sqq. III 19, 1 sq. V 7) in at least 7 books (ib. XI 17, 4), de verborum significatione (Macrob. III 18, 2) commentaria (Gell. III 9. 18, 3 sq.), de diis (Macrob. I 9, 13, cf. III 6, 17. Lyd. de mens. IV 2. cf. Quintil. I 6, 36. Lactant. inst. I 22, 9). As Gellius III 9, 8 says shat he still saw at Argos the equus Seianus, the last proprietor of which C. Cassius died a. 718, he seems to belong to this period (at the very latest to the Augustan time). Kretzschmar, de font. Gell. p. 99 sq.

7. Statius Sebosus is mentioned by Pliny in the list of his authorities in b. II and IX, and simply called Sebosus ib. III, V, VI, VII, XII, XIII. Notices are given on his authority ib. VI 36 (the time of a voyage to the insulae Hesperidum) and IX 17 (the wonders of the river Ganges). F. F. Hudeman, on the Roman seafarer Statius Sebosus, Ztsch. f. AW. 1852, nr. 3. A certain Sebosus is mentioned by Cicero, ad Att. II 14, 2. 15, 3 (a. 695), as a friend of Lutatius Catulus and a troublesome neighbour.

208. Poets of this time who kept aloof from political contention were P. Terentius Varro of Atax (a. 672—717) and Publilius Syrus; the first originally an epic poet in the manner of Ennius (bellum Sequanicum) and a writer of Saturae, subsequently more famous as a translator of Alexandrine epic and didactic poems, (Argonautae, Chorographia, Ephemeris), he being also an elegiac poet. Publilius Syrus, a native of Antioch, wrote for the stage mimi which were still performed under Nero, and from which moral sentences were extracted in the Christian era — a collection adulterated with sentences from other sources in the beginning of the Middle ages. A contemporary of these two poets was the epic poet Tanusius Geminus, from Upper Italy, who is obliged to Catullus for the bad repute he enjoys.

1. Jerome on Euseb. Chron. ad a. Abr. 1935 = Ol. 174, 3 = 672 d. St. = 82 b. Chr.: P. Terentius Varro vico Atace in provincia Narbonensi nascitur. qui postea XXXV^{um} annum agens graecas litteras cum summo studio didicit. Hor. S. I 10, 46: hoc (Satire) erat experto

frustra Varrone Atacino . . melius quod scribere possem. From this it appears that Varro was not living when this Satire was written, a. 718: see W. Teuffel, Rh. Mus. IV p. 111—113. It seems that Varro wrote satires in the earlier part of his life, to which also his bellum Sequanicum seems to belong (Priscian X p. 877 P. = 479 Htz.: P. Varro belli Sequanici libro II), a subject especially familiar to Varro both on account of the period and which was perhaps also caused by Caesar's expedition to Britain. Porphyrio ad Hor. l. l. (p. 185 Hth.): Terentius Varro Narbonensis, qui Atacinus ab Atace fluvio dictus est. Quintil. X 1, 87: Atacinus Varro in iis per quae nomen est assecutus interpres operis alieni, non spernendus quidem, verum ad augendam facultatem dicendi parum locuples. This is an allusion to the Argonautae or Argonautica of Varro, a free translation of the epic poem of Apollonius Rhodius in four books, praised by Ovid Am. I 15, 21 (Varronem . . quae nesciat aetas?). A. A. III 335 sq. Trist. II 439 sq. ex Pont. IV 16, 21. See below 247, 1 fin. Prop. II 34, 85. Stat. Silv. II 7, 77. Sen. Controv. XVI 28 (p. 195, 8 sqq. Bu.): illos optimos versus Varronis. The fragments in Wüllner p. 12 sqq. and in A. Riese's edition of Varro's Sat. Menipp. p. 261—263. R. Unger, Epistola de Varrone Atacino, Friedland 1861. 4. Besides these, he wrote a Chorographia (in Priscian there is the various reading cosmographia) in which, after a metrical introduction, Europe, Asia and Africa were treated of successively; the work of Alexander the Ephesian (surnamed ὁ Λύχνος) being the original. The fragments are collected by Riese p. 263 sq. Also an Ephemeris (concerning weather) in hexameters, after Aratus; see Bergk, Rh. Mus. I (1842) p. 372 sqq. Riese p. 264. The epic poem seems to have contained numerous descriptions. In his elegies Varro shared the erotic tendency of the Alexandrine poets and of his immediate successors. Propert. II 34, 85 sq.: haec quoque perfecto ludebat Iasone Varro, Varro Leucadiae maxima flamma suae. Ovid. Trist. II 439 sq.: is quoque phasiacas Argo qui duxit in undas non potuit Veneris furta tacere suae. These are, however, the only traces of his elegies, and perhaps his successors obscured him, or his un-Roman origin deprived him of influence. An epigram (Anthol. lat. 414 R.) on the tomb of the rich Gaul Licinus (who died as late as Tiberius: see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. IV p. 1081 sq.) may have been attributed to Varro on account of their being compatriots (Schol. Pers. II 36: non invenustum Varronis epigramma). Horace l. l. is our sole witness as to Varro's satires. In general see Fr. Wüllner, de P. Terentii Varronis Atacini vita et scriptis, Münster 1829. 4.

2. Jerome on Eus. Chron. 1974 = Ol. 184, 2 = 711 V. C. (the year in which Laberius died, see above 179, 4): Publilius (so Amand.) mimographus natione Syrus Romae scaenam tenet. The name Publilius (instead of Publius) was first evidenced and proved by E. Wölfflin, Philologus XXII p. 439 sq. Plin. N. H. XXXV 17, 58: talem (pedibus cretatis) Publilium Lochium (O. Jahn: Antiochium), mimicae scaenae conditorem, et astrologiae consobrinum eius Manilium Antiochum, item grammaticae Staberium Erotem eadem nave advectos videre proavi.

Macrob. II 7, 6 sq.: Publilius, natione Syrus, cum puer ad patronum domini esset adductus, promeruit eum non minus salibus et ingenio quam forma. (7.) ob haec et alia manumissus et maiore cura eruditus, cum mimos componeret ingentique adsensu in Italiae oppidis agere coepisset, productus Romae per Caesaris ludos (a. 709) omnes qui tunc scripta et operas suas in scenam locaverant provocavit ut singuli secum posita invicem materia pro tempore contenderent. nec ullo recusante superavit omnes, in quis et Laberium. (8.) unde Caesar . . Publilio palmam . . dedit. Two certamina, that of a mimus and of improvisation, seem to be mixed up here. Syria excelled in the art of improvisation: see Wölfflin p. 443 sq. Gell. XVII 14, 1: Publilius mimos scriptitavit. dignus habitus est qui subpar Laberio iudicaretur. (3.) huius Publilii sententiae feruntur pleraeque lepidae et ad communem sermonum usum (Macrob. II 7, 10: sensum) commendatissimae (Macrob. adcommodatissimae). Sen. Controv. VII 18, 8 sq. (Publilianae sententiae). Sen. de tranq. an. 11, 8: Publilius, tragicis comicisque vehementior ingeniis, quotiens mimicas ineptias et verba ad summam caveam spectantia reliquit, inter multa alia cothurno, non tantum sipario, fortiora et hoc ait. Epist. 8, 8: quantum disertissimorum versuum inter mimos iacet! quam multa Publilii non excalceatis, sed cothurnatis dicenda sunt! See above 8, 4. Publilius seems also to have added allusions to his time; see Cic. ad Att. XIV 2, 1.

3. The fact of only two doubtful titles of plays by Publilius being known (Non. p. 133, 7 Publilii Putatoribus, and Priscian X p. 532, 25 Htz. Publius in Murmidone) is accounted for by his being chiefly actor and improvisatore. The numerous sentences contained in them were collected in the first century of the Christian era (Gellius knows it) by some dilettante, and not until then did Publilius become a character of literary history. Specimens of simple lines are given by Gellius and Macrobius l. l. This collection has come down to us : in its most complete form (though without heading) in the codex Frisingensis (at present Monac. lat. 6292), and in the letters A to N in other mss. (saec. IX and X), altogether above 650 genuine lines. As nearly all are rules of common prudence and every-day experience, and as Seneca (Ep. 33, 7) says : pueris sententias ediscendas damus, it appears credible that this collection was used in the Schools. Some variations of the thoughts may have arisen in this sphere, others may be due to Publilius himself. The alphabetical arrangement may also be due to the first arranger, as its manner (no attention being paid to the order of the second letter, but only to the first) is in agreement with the habit of the Middle Ages: and it is certain that this order existed at the beginning of the Middle Ages. The second half was lost even before saec. IX. and prosaic sentences borrowed from Pseudo-Seneca de moribus (then more complete than now) were shaped like verses; the whole collection received the title of Sententiae (or Proverbia) Senecae and was subsequently variously interpolated from other writers, especially saec. XIV and XV. But saec. X the second half of the genuine

text had turned up again, from N to V. It was copied by the scribe of the Freisingen ms. who inserted it in the collection which had gained circulation in his time, after the prosaic proverbs of each letter. Wölfflin l. l. p. 444—453. In the editions (ed. princeps by Erasmus, Argent. 1515) the various parts were more or less separated (Wölfflin p. 454—456); the greatest confusion is in F. H. Bothe's collection (Fragm. com. lat. p. 220 sqq.) and in C. Zell's edition (Stuttg. 1829). An attempt at division in Ribbeck's Comici latini p. 261—308. See Wölfflin, Philologus XI 191. XVI 618. XXII 437 f. 447. 456. A critical edition by E. Wölfflin (Lips., Teubner) 1869; contribution to the criticism by the same, Philologus XXII 457—468. Grysar, Mimus (above 7, 1) p. 306—310, is uncritical.

4. Sen. Epist. 93, 9: paucorum versuum liber est (of Metronax), et quidem laudandus atque utilis. annales Tanusii scis quam ponderosi sint et quid vocentur. hoc est vita quorundam longa quod Tanusii sequitur annales. It is an old conjecture that quid vocentur alludes to Catullus 36, 1: annales Volusi, cacata charta (cf. 6: electissima pessimi poetae scripta; 19: plena ruris et inficetiarum, and 95, 7: Volusi annales Paduam morientur ad ipsam, where the author probably resided) and that Volusius was a disguise of the real name of Tanusius: see Schwabe, Quaest. Catull. p. 278—281. This Tanusius is undoubtedly identical with Tanusius Geminus whom Suetonius (Caes. 9, cf. Plut. Caes. 22) mentions among his authorities on the life of Caesar. R. Unger, de Tanusio Gemino annalium scriptore, Friedland 1855. 4.

5. In a similar way Catullus mentions several other (bad) poets of his time, e. g. Aquinus (Cat. 14, 18. Cic. Tusc. V 22, 62), Caesius (Catullus 14, 18), Suffenus (Catullus 14, 19. 22, 1 sqq.). Schwabe, Quaest. Catull. sq. p. 257.

6. Cornel. Nep. Att. 12, 4: L. Iulium Calidum, quem post Lucretii Catullique mortem multo elegantissimum poetam nostram tulisse aetatem vere videor posse contendere, neque minus virum bonum optimisque artibus eruditum, post proscriptionem equitum (after the list of proscriptions from the equestrian order had been closed) propter magnas eius Africanas possessiones in proscriptorum numerum a P. Volumnio praefecto fabrum Antonii absentem relatum expedivit (Atticus). It is easily perceived that this exaggeration of the merits of an obscure poet is due to friendship; he is perhaps identical with L. Julius from Africa, whom Cicero (ad fam. XIII 6, 3 sq. a. 698) recommends to Valerius Orca. To this Calidus (not Calidius) Riese attributes Anthol. lat. 776 (cf. II p. XXIX).

209. Among the members of the conspiracy against Caesar M. Iunius Brutus, an honest man, but without mental distinction, was the most active in literature, especially in philosophy and eloquence; his style and that of C. Cassius are known to us from their letters to Cicero. The same

correspondence introduces us to Cassius of Parma and C. Trebonius, who were also writers of poetry. Ampius Balbus and Actorius Naso wrote historical works hostile to Caesar.

1. M. Iunius Brutus. Cf. W. Drumann, Hist. of Rome IV. p. 18—44. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. IV. p. 518—527. 532 sq. Cic. Brut. 94, 324 of Hortensius: annis ante decem causas agere coepit (i. e. a. 659, see Brut. 64, 229: L. Crasso Q. Scaevola coss. primum in foro dixit) quam tu (Brutus) es natus. The birthyear which would be inferred from this (669 = 85) is at variance with the report, that Caesar (born 654) was himself Brutus' father, which in that case would have been absurd; besides, Vellei. II 72, 1 says: hunc exitum M. Bruti septimum et tricesimum annum agentis (a. 712) fortuna esse voluit (cf. Liv. CXXIV: annorum erat circiter XL). This would lead us to infer 675 or 676 (= 79 or 78 b. Chr.) as the year in which Brutus was born. Hence Nipperdey's conj., ante sedecim in Cicero l. l. (Rh. Mus. XIX 29.) has much probability. Cf. Cornel. Nep. Att. 8, 1 sq.: occiso Caesare .. sic M. Bruto usus est ut nullo ille adolescens aequali familiarius quam hoc sene (Atticus born 645). As early as 703 Brutus was son-in-law (Cic. ad fam. III 4, 2) to App. Claudius (above 186, 10). Aur. Victor ill. 82: Athenis philosophiam, Rhodi (not attested by any other writer) eloquentiam didicit (Pammenes, and Aristus, the brother of Antiochus, instructed him at Athens, Cic. Brut. 97, 332. Orat. 30, 105. Acad. post. I 3, 12. Plut. Brut. 2). Cytheridem mimam cum Antonio et Gallo poeta amavit. .. civili bello .. Pompeium secutus est. quo victo veniam a Caesare accepit et procos. (?) Galliam (cisalp.) rexit (a. 708). a. 710 he became praetor (urb.) through Caesar; † after the battle of Philippi, a. 712.

2. Cicero is accustomed to exaggerate his praises (e. g. Brut. 6, 22) both as Caesar's favourite and afterwards murderer; he dedicated to him de finibus, Paradoxa, de deor. nat., Tusc., Orator and Brutus. They differed as to their theory of style; cf. Cic. ad Att. XV 1 b, 2: ego secutus (Med.: solus) aliud (iudicium de optimo genere dicendi) sum, and Tac. dial. 18: legistis et Calvi et Bruti ad Ciceronem missas epistulas, ex quibus facile est deprehendere Calvum quidem Ciceroni visum exsanguem et aridum, Brutum autem otiosum atque diiunctum, rursusque Ciceronem a Calvo quidem male audisse tanquam solutum et enervem, a Bruto autem , . tamquam fractum atque elumbem. His diction is described by gravitas (Quintil. XII 10, 10. Tac. dial. 25). He endeavoured to attain to a rhythmical flow of prose (Quintil. IX 4, 76); hence Cicero's criticism in his Orator. Both Quintiliam X 1, 123, who says that in his philosophical writings multo quam in orationibus praestantior suffecit ponderi rerum, and Tac. dial. 21 agree, the latter saying: Brutum philosophiae suae relinquamus. nam in orationibus minorem esse fama sua etiam admiratores eius fatentur. nisi forte quisquam .. Bruti pro Deiotaro rege (cf. Cic.

Brut. 5, 21. ad Att. XIV 1, 2) ceterosque eiusdem lentitudinis ac teporis libros legit, nisi qui et carmina eorundem miratur; fecerunt enim et carmina (see above 182, 3.) Cf. Stat. Silv. IV 9, 20: Bruti senis oscitationes. Other published speeches of Brutus: de dictatura Pompei (Quintil. IX 3, 95) of a. 703; his speech delivered on 17 March 710 on the Capitol (Cic. ad Att. XV 1 b, 2), and other contiones Bruti (falsa quidem in Augustum probra, sed multa cum acerbitate habent, Tac. A. IV 34); his declamation pro Milone (orationem Brutus exercitationis gratia scripsit, Quintil. X 1, 23 cf. 5, 20. III 6, 93. Ascon. in Mil. p. 42 Or. Schol. Bob. p. 276); laudatio of his father-in-law App. Claudius (Diomed. p. 367 K.) and of his uncle M. Cato (Cic. ad Att. XIII 46, 2. cf. XII 21, 1). See Meyer, orat. rom.[2] p. 446—452.

3. On his philosophical works see Cic. Acad. post. I 3, 12. He had an inclination to the Old Academy, Cic. Brut. 31, 120. 40, 149. We find mentions of a treatise de virtute (dedicated to Cicero, s. fin. I 3, 8. Tusc. V 1, 1. Sen. consol. ad Helv. 9, 4 sqq. cf. 8, 1), *περὶ καθήκοντος* (Sen. Ep. 95, 45; cf. M. Brutus de officiis ap. Priscian VI p. 679 P. = 199 Htz.), de patientia (Diomed. I. p. 378 P. = 383 K.). His abridgement of the Annals of Fannius and Antipater (see above 132, 3 and 4) was probably an early work. In the same way, Brutus made an abridgement of Polybius (Plut. Brut. 4)

4. Letters. (M.) Brutus in epistolis (Quintil. IX 4, 75. Diomed. I. p. 388 K. Priscian. IX. p. 474 Htz. cf. Plin. N. H. XXXIII 12: M. Bruti in Philippicis campis epistolae reperiuntur, frementes fibulas tribunicias ex auro geri), ad Caesarem (Charis. I. p. 130 K.), ad Ciceronem (Tac. dial. 18). On the correspondence of Brutus and Cicero see above 171, 4. The letters of Brutus in Greek are the production of a rhetorician, edited for the last time by A. Westermann (Bruti epistolae graecae ex rec. A. W., Lips. 1856. 4). Cf. Phot. cod. 158, p. 101 Bk. R. Hercher, Philologus VIII. p. 187—190. His verses (see above the quotation from Tac. dial. 21) seem to have been erotic, see the enumeration in Pliny Ep. V 3, 5 (above 26, 1).

5. D. Iunius Brutus, as adolescens with Caesar a. 698 sq. in Gaul (b. g. III 11. VII 9, 87) and on his side also in the Civil war, honoured with his confidence and designated by him Cons. for 712; executed by M. Antony in summer 711. His letters to Cicero in 710 and 711 (ad fam. XI 1—4. 9—11. 13. 13a. 19. 20. 23. 26) are sad specimens of the want of thought and courage exhibited by him ever after the assassination of Caesar. W. Drumann Hist. of Rome IV p. 9—13. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. IV. p. 513—516, ur. 19.

6. C. Cassius Longinus, somewhat older than M. Brutus (Plut. Brut. 29. 40), a. 701 sqq. Quaestor in Parthia, 705 tr. pleb.; in the Civil war of Pompey's party, vanquished by Caesar and appointed one of his legates, in 710 praetor together with M. Brutus; † after the battle of Philippi (712). He was a hard, trenchant character, but egotistical and without higher aims (cf. Plut. Brut. 29. comp. c. Dione 1.

Brut. 37: *Κάσσιος τοῖς Ἐπικούρου λόγοις χρώμενος καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐθος ἔχων*). Among his letters to Cicero, ad fam. XV 19 (a. 709) is a good-humoured echo of Cicero's previous letter; XII 11—13 (of 711) are business accounts, partly calculated to flatter Cicero. W. Drumann Hist. of Rome II. p. 117—152. A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. II. p. 194—198, nr. 11.

7. Cassius Parmensis after being one of the assassins of Caesar, commanded part of the fleet in Asia (a. 711). He gives an account of his doings in a letter full of flattery in which he also imitates Cicero's style: ad fam. XII 13. He was subsequently with Sex. Pompey and M. Antony, and was executed after the battle of Actium, 723. Drumann II. p. 161—163. A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. I. p. 200 sq. nr. 20. Porphyrio on Hor. Ep. I 4, 3 (scribere quod Cassi Parmensis opuscula vincat), p. 393 Hth.: in partibus Cassii et Bruti cum Horatio tribunus mil. militavit. . . scripserat multas tragoedias Cassius. Acro (p. 390 H.): Epicureus fuit et poeta. . . satiras scripsit. . . aliquot generibus stilum exercuit. inter quae opera Elegia et epigrammata eius laudantur. An iambic line by Cassius is mentioned by Quintilian V 11, 24, and another senarius, written in the old manner which admitted of numerous spondees, is quoted from a praetexta Brutus of a certain Cassius by Varro L. L. VI 7. VII 72. A passage from an abusive letter of Cass. Parm. on Octavian is given by Suet. Aug. 4. A. Weichert, de L. Varii et Cassii Parmensis vita et carminibus (Grimma 1836), p. 176—300.

8. To about the same time as Cassius Parmensis belongs the fast writer Cassius Etruscus mentioned by Hor. S. I 10, 69—71; see Kirchner's note (p. 364 sq.)

9. C. Trebonius, Quaestor 694, trib. pl. 699, Caesar's legate in Gaul a. 700 sqq. and on his side in the Civil War; praet. urb. 706; Cons. 709; killed by Dolabella in February 711. A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. VI 2. p. 2083 sq., Nr. 9. A. 707 he appears to have made a collection of Cicero's puns and witty sayings; cf. ad fam. XV 21, 1—3, e. g.: liber iste quem mihi misisti quantam habet declarationem amoris tui! primum quod tibi facetum videtur quidquid ego dixi, . . deinde quod illa . . fiunt narrante te venustissima. quin etiam ante quam ad me veniatur risus omnis paene consumitur. In his letter to Cicero (ad fam. XII 16, a. 710) he speaks of the elder and younger Cicero with great attachment and forwards to them versiculi (perhaps iambics against M. Antony), on the free tone of which he observes: turpitudo personae eius in quam liberius invehimur nos vindicabit (16, 3). His request is (16, 4): tu, sicut mihi pollicitus es, adiunges me quam primum ad tuos sermones.

10. Suet. Caes. 75 extr.: Pitholai carminibus maledicentissimis laceratam existimationem suam civili animo tulit. He may, perhaps, be the M. Voltacilius (according to the mss.; v. Jan Otacilius, but see above 145, 2) Pitholaus of whom Macrob. II 10, 13 quotes a witticism

on the one-day's Consul (a. 709) Caninius Rebilus, as well as (according to Bentley) the Rhodius Pitholeo in Horace (S. I 10, 22) who (Acro on Hor. l. l., p. 170 Hth.) dicitur epigrammata ridicula scripsisse in quibus graeca verba mixta erant cum latinis.

11. T. Ampius Balbus, trib. pl. 691, praetor 696, a friend of Cicero's, (speech pro T. Ampio, Quintil. III 8, 50), a zealous partisan of Pompey; see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. I 1 p. 920 sq. nr. 2. Suet. Caes. 77 quotes from Ampius some criticism on Caesar; cf. Cic. ad fam. VI 12, 5 (a. 708): cum studium tuum consumas in virorum fortium factis memoriae prodendis.

12. M. Actorius Naso wrote, according to Suet. Caes. 9 (cf. 52 Naso), on Caesar or the time of the Civil War.

210. Ticidas, the author of erotic poems (on Perilla), appears to belong to the same circle, as well as C. Helvius Cinna, who in his epic poem of Zmyrna laboriously plodded along in the track of the erudite Alexandrine poets, and also another friend of Catullus, the talented and consistent C. Licinius Calvus (a. 672—707), a man equally eminent as juridical pleader and poet, and who purposely bridled his abundant vivacity by rigorous attention to form. In eloquence he followed the New Attic School, and in poetry he knew how to combine the correctness of the Alexandrine school with an impassioned treatment of his subject, both in love and hatred, in the manner of Catullus and closely approaching him. On the other hand, Anser (another writer of erotic poetry in this period) was an adherent of M. Antony, and owing to his political character his life extended into the Augustan period.

1. Ovid Trist. II 433 sq. (after Catullus and Calvus, before Cinna): quid referam Ticidae, quid Memmi carmen, apud quos rebus abest nomen nominibusque pudor? Apulei. apol. 10: accusent . . Ticidam similiter, quod quae Metella erat Perillam scripserit. A pentameter by Ticidas in praise of Valerius Cato's Lydia is quoted by Suet. gramm. 11, and Ticidas is mentioned ib. 4 together with Furius Bibaculus and (Valerius) Cato. Priscian V p. 189, 2 sqq. (Htz.): sole (as vocative) quoque antiqui. Ticidas in hymenaeo: felix lectule talibus sole amoribus.

2. C. (Catullus 10, 30) Helvius Cinna was the companion of Catullus in the suite of the praetor Memmius (above 200, 2) in Bithynia (Catull. 10, 29 sq.) Very little besides this is known of his life. We do not even know with certainty what side he took in the Civil War; but the antithesis to Anser and the association with L. Varius in Virg.

Ecl. IX 35 sq. show that he was at last of the party of Octavian, perhaps after having first been like his friends one of the opponents of Caesar and an enthusiastic admirer of the ‚liberators'. His life extended beyond a. 710, whence it appears that he was not the Caesarian tribune of the people, C. Helvius Cinna, who was killed at the funeral of Caesar owing to a mistake. Plutarch (Brut. 20) erroneously calls the latter *ποιητικὸς ἀνήρ*, owing to a confusion with the better known man of that name, the poet. Virgil Ecl. IX 35 (perhaps a. 714) mentions the poet as still living, and the Propempticon Pollionis seems to point beyond the year 710. Cinna is no more mentioned after 715, and it is possible that he died about that time.

3. His principal work was his Smyrna (Zmyrna), in which he treated of the unnatural love of Myrrha for her father Cinyras, the subject being in the manner of the Alexandrine poets. Cinna devoted ten years to this poem (Catull. 95. Quintil. X 4, 4. Serv. and Philargyr. on Virg. Ecl. 1. 1. Porphyr. and Acro on Hor. Ep. II 3, 388), which was after all not a long one (Catull. 95, 9), a fact equally characteristic of his lack of real poetical talent and his industry in formal polish. The fragments of Cinna prove him to have belonged to the *σπουδειάζοντες*. Philargyrius l. l. (in Lion's Servius II. p. 327) states the result of all this: fuit autem liber obscurus adeo ut et nonnulli eius aetatis grammatici (especially L. Crassitius) in eum scripserint magnamque ex eius enarratione sint gloriam consecuti. quod obscurus fuerit etiam Martialis ostendit in illo versu (X 21, 4): iudice te melior Cinna Marone fuit. Ovid Trist. II 435 places him among the erotic poets (Cinna quoque his comes est, cf. n. 1); we are justified in refusing credit to Gellius both in his statement that these poems were illepida and that he was non ignobilis neque indoctus poeta (Gell. XIX 13, 5). Poemata (lyric poems) by him in Gell. IX 12, 12 (senarius claudus) and XIX 13, 5 (hendecasyllabics). Cinna epigrammatis Non. Marc. p. 87, 27 cf. Isidor. Orig. VI 12, 2 (two distichs accompanying the present of a copy of Aratus' *Φαινόμενα*, = Anthol. lat. II 251 Burm. = 76 Meyer). Four hexameters from a Propempticon Pollionis (Charis. I p. 99 P. = 124 K.) on the occasion of one of his expeditions (perhaps a. 715 against the Parthines). There was a commentary on or introduction to this by Hyginus (Charis. I. p. 134, 12 K.: Iulius Hyginus in Cinnae propemptico). See A. Weichert, de C. Helvio Cinna poeta, in his poett. latt. vitae etc. (Lips. 1830) p. 147—187, and on the fragments of Cinna's poems ib. p. 187—202; L. Müller's Catullus p. 87—89.

4. On a (probably epic) poem of mythological contents, on Cybele, was engaged another friend of Catullus, Caecilius at Novium Comum: see Catull. 35, 13 sqq.; but we do not know whether it was ever finished and published.

5. C. Licinius Macer (Cic. ad Qu. fr. II 4, 1) Calvus (with two surnames: see Drumann Hist. of Rome IV p. 195, n. 72), the son of the annalist Licinius Macer (above 143, 2), Val. Max. IX 12, 7. He

was born May 28, 672: see above 206, 5. Cicero's letter to Trebonius, ad fam. XV 21, 4 (a. 707) presupposes the death of Calvus. A description of him is given by Cic. Brut. 81, 279: facienda mentio est . . duorum adolescentium qui, si diutius vixissent, magnam essent eloquentiae laudem consecuti, namely C. Curio (above 206, 1) and C. Licinius Calvus. 82, 283: Calvus . . orator fuit cum litteris eruditior quam Curio tum etiam accuratius quoddam dicendi et exquisitius afferebat genus. quod quamquam scienter eleganterque tractabat, nimium tamen inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans metuensque ne vitiosum colligeret etiam verum sanguinem deperdebat. itaque eius oratio nimia religione attenuata doctis et attente audientibus erat illustris, a multitudine autem et a foro . . devorabatur. (284.) Tum Brutus, atticum se, inquit, Calvus noster dici oratorem volebat; inde erat ista exilitas, quam ille de industria consequebatur. ad fam. l. l.: genus quoddam sequebatur in quo, iudicio lapsus, quo valebat, tamen assequebatur quod probaret. multae erant et reconditae litterae, vis non erat. . . de ingenio eius valde existimavi bene. Cf. Tac. dial. 18 (above 209, 1). Quintil. X 1, 115: est (Calvi) et sancta (cf. XII 10, 11) et gravis oratio et frequenter vehemens quoque. imitator autem est Atticorum fecitque illi properata mors iniuriam. Sen. controv. VII 19. p. 210 sq. Bu.: Calvus, qui diu cum Cicerone iniquissimam litem de principatu eloquentiae habuit, usque eo violentus accusator et concitatus fuit ut in media eius actione surgeret Vatinius reus et exclamaret: rogo vos, iudices, num si iste disertus est ideo me damnari oportet? . . solebat praeterea excedere subsellia sua et impetu latus usque in adversariorum partem transcurrere. . . compositio quoque eius in actionibus ad exemplum Demosthenis viget: nihil in illa placidum, nihil lene est, omnia excitata et fluctuantia. Another feature, his select phraseology, is mentioned by Tac. dial. 25 (adstrictior), Apulej. apol. 95 (argutiae); but Fronto p. 114 Naber says: in iudiciis . . Calvus rixatur.

6. Seneca l. l. (p. 211, 7 sq. Bu.): erat (Calvus) parvolus statura, propter quod etiam Catullus in hendecasyllabis (53, 5) vocat illum „salaputtium disertum." Hence Ovid Trist. II 431: exigui Calvi. Tac. dial. 21: ipse mihi (a patron of modern eloquence) Calvus, cum unum et viginti, ut puto, libros (i. e. speeches) reliquerit, vix in una et altera oratiuncula satisfacit. nec dissentire ceteros ab hoc meo iudicio video: quotus enim quisque Calvi in Asitium aut in Drusum legit? at hercle in omnium studiosorum manibus versantur accusationes quae in Vatinium inscribuntur ac praecipue secunda (which shows that there were at least three) ex his oratio; est enim verbis ornata et sententiis, auribus iudicum accommodata. Ib. 34 extr.: uno et vicesimo (aetatis anno) Caesar Dolabellam, altero et vicesimo Asinius Pollio C. Catonem, non multum aetate antecedens Calvus Vatinium iis orationibus insecuti sunt quas hodie quoque cum admiratione legimus. Cf. Quintil. XII 6, 1: cum . . Calvus, Caesar, Pollio multum ante quaestoriam omnes aetatem (which was then the thirtieth year)

gravissima iudicia susceperint. Calvus acted several times as the accuser of P. Vatinius; the first time perhaps a. 698 de vi, a second time de sodaliciis (or with a more general term, ambitus: Charis. p. 229, 9 K.) in August 700, when Cicero defended the accused (Schol. Bob. p. 262. Hieronym. adv. Rufin. III 39 = II. p. 565 Vall.); a third time perhaps a. 700, when Cicero was one of the witnesses in favour of Vatinius (ad fam. I 9, 4. 19); see Nipperdey, Rhein. Mus. XIX. p. 581—588. Meyer, orator. rom. p. 474—478. In the same way Calvus defended P. Sestius a. 698 (Schol. Rob. p. 292) and Messius; according to Seneca l. l. (p. 211, 10 sqq.) the epilogue to this speech was non tantum emollitae compositionis sed infractae. It is not very probable that Calvus wrote also commentarii on a rhetorical subject, as might be inferred from the corrupt place in Tac. dial. 23, where we should rather read L. Aeli instead of Calvi (Rhein. Mus. XIX p. 568 sq.)

7. Seneca l. l. (p. 211, 14 sq. Bu.): carmina quoque eius (of Calvus), quamvis iocosa sint, plena sunt ingentis animi, as a specimen of which he quotes a cutting word against Pompey; cf. Schol. Lucan. VII 726. Suet. Caes. 73: Gaio Calvo post famosa epigrammata (cf. c. 49) de reconciliatione per amicos (Catullus? cf. 201, 4) 'agenti ultro ac prior scripsit. We know of hendecasyllabics (against M'. Curius), and choliambics (against Tigellius). There were also erotic poems; see above 26, 1. Ovid Trist. II 431 sq.: par (like Catullus' poems on Lesbia) fuit exigui similisque licentia Calvi, detexit variis qui sua furta modis. Cf. Prop. III 25, 4. 32, 89 sq.: haec etiam docti (doctus seems to show that he wrote in the manner of the Alexandrine poets) confessa est pagina Calvi, cum caneret miserae funera Quintiliae (Catull. 96, 6), who probably was his wife. From this poem may be derived the Glyconean line quoted by Charis. I. p. 147 K. (Licinius Calvus in poemate). Elegies seem indicated by such fragments as in Charis. I. p. 101 K. (Calvus in carminibus). Calvus in Epithalamio (dactylic lines), Priscian. VI. p. 658 P. = 170 Htz. Part of his poems were devoted to his friends, cf. Charis. I. p. 77, 3 K.: Calvus ad amicos (does this mean a poetical Epistle?): ne triclinarius (perhaps anapaestic metres). There is also mentioned an epic poem Io (Serv. Verg. Ecl. VI 47. VIII 4. Calvus in Io, in Keil's gramm. lat. IV. p. 226, 8. 234, 32). A collection of his fragments is given in the appendix of Lachmann's Catullus, p. 85—87, also L. Müller p. 83—87, and in Weichert p. 131—146. He is very much like Catullus, and their names are often mentioned together, e. g. Hor. Sat. I 10, 19. Prop. III 25, 4. 32, 87 sqq. Ovid Am. III 9, 62 (cum Calvo, docte Catulle, tuo), Trist. II 431 sq. Plin. Ep. I 16, 5. IV 27. 4. Catullus addressed to him: 14. 50. 96. Cf. Schwabe, Quaest. Catull. p. 255—265. See A. Weichert, poetar. latt. vitae etc. p. 89—130. R. Unger, Valg. Ruf. (1848) p. 47—51.

8. Ovid Trist. II 435: Cinna his (erotic poets like Ticidas and Memmius) comes est Cinnaque procacior Anser. He is called poeta by Servius on Verg. Ecl. 7, 21. He is no doubt the same as the one derided by Cicero (Phil. XIII 5, 11): ii qui nunc Mutinam oppugnant,

D. Brutum obsident, de Falerno Anseres depellantur. This would imply that he was a zealous partisan of Antony's. To a guess we should perhaps ascribe the notice of Servius on Verg. Ecl. 9, 36: alludit ad Anserem quendam Antonii poetam (Unger p. 18 sq. proposes comitem) qui eius landes scribebat. de hoc etiam Cicero (l. l.) . . ipsum enim agrum (Falernum) ei donarat Antonius. So also the alphabetical glossary on Virgil in Lion's Servius II p. 373: Anser poeta erat Antonii, de quo Mel(issus? s. d.) in Philippica Ciceronis dixit etc. But it is certainly due to erroneous interpretation when Servius l. l. asserts: quem ob hoc (as an adherent of Antony) per transitum carpsit (Vergilius); Virgil's words (Ecl. 9, 35 sq.) 'neque adhuc Vario videor nec dicere Cinna digna, sed argutos inter strepere anser olores' the expression of the modesty of the young poet who compares his relation to the older poets with that of a goose to swans (cf. Symmach. Epist. I 1: liceat inter olores canoros anserem strepere, Apollin. Sidon. IX 2. carm. 22 praef., and more in Unger p. 9 sq.). Nor does Propertius allude to Anser in the difficult passage III 32, 83 sq.: nec minor his animis, aut, si minor, ore, canorus, anseris indocto carmine cessit olor = *οὐδὲ χείρων ὢν τούτων* (Georgics and Aeneid, cf. haec 81) *τὸ πνεῦμα ἤ, εἶπερ χείρων, τό γε στόμα (μόνον) ὁ λιγὺς κύκνος* (Virgil) *ὑπεχώρησεν ἀναβαλόμενος τὸ ἄτεχνον τοῦ χηνὸς ᾆσμα* (tho Bucolics). Hence it has no foundation to place Anser among the obtrectatores Vergilii, a modest beginning of which appears in a portion of Donatus' vita Vergilii 67 (Reifferscheid's Suetonius p. 66) which is not, however, found in the Bernensis: coaevos omnes poetas ita adiunctos habuit ut, cum inter se plurimum invidia arderent, illum una omnes colerent, Varius, Tucca, Horatius, Gallus, Propertius. Anser vero, quoniam Antonii partes secutus est, illum non observasse dicitur. Cornificius (above 206, 2) ob perversam naturam illum non tulit. Against Weichert, poett. latt. vitae etc. p. 159—168, see R. Unger, de Ansere poeta (on G. G. Buchka's jubilee), Neubrandenburg 1858. 19 pp. 4.

211. C. Valerius Catullus of Verona (a. 667—700) is the greatest lyric poet of Roman literature. Though he followed at first the track of the Alexandrine poets, he subsequently developed a rich lyric talent, which was ripened by his bitter experience of life and his love for Lesbia. His early death prevented him from attaining to harmony, beauty and maturity, he remained a youth, passionate both in love and hatred, hot-blooded and void of regard, unreserved in his attachments and fearfully sensitive, ideal and yet coarse, tender and yet venomous, boldly spurning the bars of manners and modesty.

1. His praenomen rests on the authority of Apulej. apol. 10 (accusent C. Catullum quod Lesbiam pro Clodia nominarit) and Hieron. Eus. chron. a. Abr. 1930 = Ol. 173, 2 = 667 v. c. = 87 b. Chr.;

Gaius Valerius Catullus scriptor lyricus Veronae nascitur. In Plin. N. H. XXXVII 6, 81 Q. Catullus, and in the Datanus = Riccardianus and Cuiacianus the same has arisen from a confusion with Q. (Lutatius) Catulus; see F. Osann, comment. sem. philol. Giss. 1856. c. 4. Schwabe, Quaest. Catull. p. 6 sqq. 11—24. He was born at Verona, Ovid. Amor. III 15, 7. Martial. XIV 195 and others. He had an estate at Sirmio.

2. For the year of his death see Jerome l. l. Abr. 1959 = 696 but APF in 1960 = 697 = 57 b. Chr.: Catullus XXX aetatis anno Romae moritur. Jerome (or rather Suetonius) is therefore consistent in the year of his birth and death: yet it appears from Catull. 113, 2 that the latter is erroneously placed 696 or a. 697: consule Pompeio .. nunc iterum (a. 699) cf. 11, 12 and 29, 20, also 52, 2 sq. (a. 700); a date beyond 700 is indicated only by c. 52: sella in curuli Struma Nonius sedet, per consulatum peierat Vatinius, as Vatinius was not consul until the close of a. 707. But he calculated on being consul long before, and even used to swear: ita consul fiam, ut haec vera sunt: cf. Cic. in Vatin. interrog. 2, 6. 5, 11. Schol. Bob. p. 315 Or.; and these hopes of Vatinius were further strengthened by the agreement of the triumvirs at Luca (a. 698, cf. Cic. ad Att. IV 8b, 2). It should also be observed that the years 700—707, especially 702 and 705, would furnish Catullus with abundant matter for cutting epigrams; but as there is no trace at all of them in his poems, it appears that he did not live until 702 sqq. On the other hand it is certain that Catullus died very young (Ovid Amor III 9, 61 sq.: iuvenilia cinctus tempora, .. docte Catulle, in Elysium). If we place his death a. 700 or 701, he actually died young, as the doubts against the year 667 in which he was born cannot be substantiated. Schwabe, Quaest. Cat. p. 33—48.

3. His liaison with Lesbia. Prop. III 32, 87 sq.: haec quoque lascivi cantarunt scripta Catulli, Lesbia quis ipsa notior est Helena. Ovid Trist. II 427 sq.: sic sua lascivo cantata est saepe Catullo femina, cui falsum Lesbia nomen erat. nec contentus ea multos volgavit amores in quibus ipse suum fassus adulteriumst (cf. Schwabe, Quaest. Cat. p. 137). Martial. VIII 73, 8: Lesbia dictavit, docte Catulle, tibi and others. The statement of Apulejus (see n. 1) that her real name was Clodia is confirmed by Cicero's speech pro Caelio (Schwabe, Quaest. Cat. p. 135). She was the elder sister of P. Clodius (born c. 661) and was herself born c. 660, if not before, and married to her cousin, Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer, Cos. 694, who died (perhaps through his wife) 695, a man known to us also by his touchy letter to Cicero (ad fam. V 1, a. 692); cf. A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. II p. 26 sq. n. 15 and p. 420 n. 45. Just as she entangled other young men (e. g. Caelius Rufus), she knew how to catch the enthusiastic and ingenious youth from the province, though Catullus was several years younger than she; for several years (perhaps 693—696, Schwabe Quaest. Cat. p. 129—134) he remained her slave and addressed the most fiery songs to her, nay after his quarrels with her he returned to her again, until at

last his eyes were opened and he saw that she whom he had worshipped as an ideal being was simply a prostitute. Several attempts have been made to trace the history of this connexion with the help of Catullus' poetry; see W. Th. Jungclaussen, on the chronology etc. (Itzehoe 1857) p. 8—17. Schwabe, Quaest. Catull. p. 71—129. 358 sq. Ribbeck, Catullus (1863) p. 29—45. 56 sq. W. Vorländer, de Catulli ad Lesbiam carminibus, Bonn 1864, p. 1—46. R. Westphal, Catullus' poems (Breslau 1867) p. 33—61. 100—149. The assumption of Westphal as to erotic relations between Clodia (Lesbia) and Cicero has been impugned by Rettig, Catulliana I, before the catalogue of lectures at Bern, Summer 1868. 4. p. 3—12. H. H. Heskamp, de C. vita et ordine quo carmina amatoria sunt scripta, Münster 1869. 34 pp. See note 12.

4. Catullus staid in Bithynia in the train of the propraetor Memmius (above 200, 2) together with Helvius Cinna and others, from spring 697 till 698, but without the desired profits: see c. 10, 6 sqq. 28, 7 sqq. 31, 5 sqq. 46. Schwabe, Quaest. Cat. p. 158—174. On his journey back he visited the tomb of his brother who had previously died in Troas: c. 101. cf. 65, 1—15. 68a, 19—26. 68b, 91—100. Schwabe, l. l., p. 176—181.

5. Attacks on Caesar and his adherents. Suet. Caes. 73: Valerium Catullum, a quo sibi versiculis de Mamurra (c. 29 end of 699, and especially c. 57; see O. Jahn, Hermes II p. 240 sq.) perpetua stigmata imposita non dissimulaverat, satis facientem eadem die adhibuit cenae (probably beginning of 700, at Verona) hospitioque patris eius sicut consueverat uti perseveravit. See Tac. A. IV 34 (above 179, 5). Besides this, c. 94. 105. 114. 115 (cf. 42, 4) are specially directed against Mamurra, whom the poet after his reconciliation with Caesar calls Mentula. The poet's hatred seems to have been originally directed against Mamurra, and Caesar appears to have been dragged in merely on account of his connexion with Mamurra. At first the poet appears defiant (c. 93) and almost repeats his attacks (54, 6 sq.), but then he makes advances to Caesar (Suet. l. l.) and apologizes c. 11, 10—12. The way in which Caesar was probably spoken of in the circle of the friends of Catullus, may also have caused our poet to attack him, though political reasons do not appear to have swayed him much. It is probable that he was instrumental in recommending Calvus to Caesar (see 210, 7). See on the whole question Schwabe, Quaest. Cat. p. 182—239, and C. Pleitner, on Catullus' poems concerning Caesar and Mamurra, Speier 1849. 4.

6. The earliest poems of Catullus in his collection of 116 seem to be the imitations of Alexandrine poems, especially his epic poem (in 408 hexameters) on the nuptials of Peleus and Thetis (c. 64), probably a translation: see W. Hertzberg in his translation, 1862, p. 130 sq., perhaps from Callimachus (see A. Riese, Rh. Mus. XXI p. 498—509.). Spondaic conclusions of lines (above 210, 2) and alliteration are very frequent in this poem. There is again the translation of Callimachus'

elegy on the hair of Queen Berenice (c. 66) with a dedication to Hortensius (c. 65), and the dialogue with a door (c. 67) and the Epithalamium imitated from a Sapphic one (c. 62) and the epistle to Manlius in elegiacs (68a). On account of its mythological subject and the archaic compounds in it the poem on Attis (63) seems also to belong to the earlier poems, though its formal perfection and the masterly treatment of the galliambic measure indicate a high perfection of art. In the 'encomion to Allius' or Mallius (c. 68b) Westphal, on Catullus' poems p. 78 sqq., has traced the traditional division into seven parts-prologue, archa (lyric), catatropa, omphalos (epic), metacatatropa, sphragis (lyric), epilogos. — His lyric and iambic poems are free from all learned allusions and form spontaneous effusions of a mind excited either by love or hatred, whence they are sometimes full of genial warmth and then again of biting harshness. The undisguised naturalism in many of them is partly Roman and republican, partly the result of a deep bitterness of mind created by his unfortunate affair with Lesbia. But they all are remarkable for a brilliant employment of the most varied forms of metre. The poem on the marriage of Manlius Torquatus (n. 61) is one of the most pleasing. The hymn on Diana (c. 34) seems to have been composed for some religious ceremony.

7. As the nature of the subject-matter proves, Catullus' poems were first published separately — a fact evidenced by the reference to c. 5 and 7 in c. 16, 2. The dedication to Cornelius Nepos proves that Catullus himself, suffering and with a presentiment of his early death (c. 38. 52), made and published a collected edition of his poems. That he did not admit all his previously published poems into this, is shown by the quotations of lines not met with in our present collection (see e. g. Schwabe's Catullus p. 169—172). From the allusions contained in it (see n. 1), this edition would seem to have been published a. 700, and as Schwabe Quaest. Cat. p. 297 thinks, the middle of it: but Fr. Bücheler (Greifswald Ind. Lect. hib. 1868 sq. p. 15—17) places it two or three months sooner assuming, as he does, that Cic. ad Q. fr. II 13, 4 (auricula infuma molliorem) alludes to Catullus 25, 2 (mollior . . imula auricilla, An allusion to 62, 1 (vesper adest) in Varro L. L. VII 50 (dicit Valerius, according te Schwabe).

8. According to the traditional arrangement of the poems which is no doubt due to Catullus himself, the long poems occupy the middle of the collection (c. 61—68) and are surrounded by smaller poems, the iambic and melic poems (i. e. hendecasyllabics, choliambs, Sapphic strophes etc.) preceding, and those in elegiacs (epigrams) preceding: c. 65—68 form the transition to the second part, just as c. 61 leads from the first part. In this first part variation is attended to, poems on kindred subjects being separated by others, but those of the second part are arranged according to metre and subjects: see Westphal, Cat.'s Poems, 1—12. In the third part reigns great confusion, first noticed by Scaliger, then explained by Lachmann and even better by Bergk (Rh. Mus. XV p. 507—513) and Westphal (l. l. p. 12—32) by

the assumption of a transposition of leaves (the scribe of the archetype copying fol. c. before fol. b). As soon as this confusion is got rid of, the third part also shows an analogous arrangement (Westphal p. 23 sq.).

9. All our mss. of Catullus' poems may be traced to an archetype long since lost. In an anthology made in France between the 7th and 9th centuries the 62nd poem was copied from it: of this anthology we possess two incomplete copies, Paris. 8071 (= liber Thuaneus) and Vindob. 277, but only the first contains the poem of Catullus. In the first half of the 10th century, or earlier, a copy of all the poems of Catullus was made from this archetype, and this was read by the French monk Rather, bishop of Verona, a. 965, in the library of the chapter, who states it to have been 'exemplar corruptissimum'. This codex Veronensis was not heard of for very long, until in the beginning of the 14th century it was again discovered, when Petrarch read it; but only 20 years after the discovery it was lost again. The carliest ms. and the only one that can be proved to have been taken from the cod. Veronensis direct, is the Sangermanensis (St. Germain, now at Paris, G. in Rossbach and Schwabe), of a. 1375. As concerns the about 70 other mss., it cannot be shown in how many degrees they are derived from the cod. Veron. which was itself lost again. The mss. next in value to the Sangermanensis are the Colbertinus (saec. XV in Paris, C in Schwabe), Santenianus (saec. XV at Berlin, L), then Datanus (of a. 1463, at Berlin, D) which is greatly interpolated, and Hamburgensis (H), not so much interpolated as full of clerical errors. M. Haupt, Quaest. Catull. (1837) p. 2—9. Th. Heyse, ranslat ion of Catullus, 1855, p. 279—282. L. Schwabe, Trans. of the Philologial Congress at Meissen (Leipzig 1864) p. 111—120, in the Dorpat Catalogue 1865. 4. and before his edition (1866) p. I—XXXIII. Cf. Philologus XXIV p. 351—354. See also W. Fröhner, Philologus XIV p. 568—585. A. Rossbach, codicum Cat. quos Silligius descripsit collationes, Breslau 1859. 4.

10. Editions (mostly together with Tibullus and Propertius). Ed princeps s. l. 1472. 4. Parm. 1473. 4. Interpolated editions (especially by Avancius and Guarinus) from ed. Regiensis 1481 fol. Cum comm. Mureti, Ven. 1554. Cum comm. Achillis Statii, Ven. 1566. Cum castigationibus Ios. Scaligeri, Par. 1577, Antv. 1582, Heidelb. 1600. Cum comm. Is. Vossii (London 1684. 4.), I. A. Vulpii (Patav. 1710. 1737. 4.). Cum perp. adn. G. W. Döring, Lips. 1788—1792; Altenb. 1834. Recogn. c. var. lect. I. Sillig, Gotting. 1823. Ex rec. C. Lachmanni, Berol. 1829; ed. alt. 1861. Recogn. A. Rossbach, Lips., Teubner, 1854; ed. II. 1860. Recogn. L. Schwabe, Gissae 1866. Recogn., app. criticum, prolegomena, appendices adiecit R. Ellis, Lond. 1867. Editions of the text by M. Haupt (Lips. 1853. 1861. 1868), C. Uschner (Berlin 1867), Lucian Müller, Teubner 1870.

11. Essays on Catullus on general points and concerning the subject matter. F. Jacobs in his supplements to Sulzer I. p. 158—171.

C. Zell, Vacation-writings I. p. 125—143. C. G. Helbig, German Annals, 1842, p. 1213—1219. J. v. G. Fröhlich, on the order of the poems of Catullus, Trans. of the Academy at Munich, cl. I, vol. III, 1843, p. 689—716. W. Th. Jungclaussen, on the chronology of the poems of Catullus, Itzehoe 1857. 4. L. Schwabe, Quaest. Catullianarum liber I, Gissae 1862. 366 pp. (Vol. I, 1 of his edition). E. Bruner, de ordine et temporibus carminum C., Acta soc. sc. Fennicae, VII (Helsingfors 1863) p. 599—657. O. Ribbeck, C. Val. Cat., a literary sketch, Kiel 1863. B. Richter, de Catulli vita et carminibus P. I., Freiburg 1825. 4. Nobbe, de metris C., Lips. 1820. 1821. 4. M. Haupt, Catullus qua arte poetas expresserit alexandrinos, Berlin 1855. 4. O. Franke, de artificiosa carminum C. compositione, Greifswald and Berlin 1866. Mommsen, Hist. of Rome III² p. 536 sq. 554 sqq. W. Teuffel before his translation (1862) p. 6—19.

12. Contributions to criticism and explanation. G. V. A. Pfeiffer, Symbolae C., Gotting. 1834. M. Haupt, Quaestiones C. (Lips. 1837); Observationes criticae (Lips. 1841) and de nonnullis C. carm., Berol. 1857. 4. F. Hand, Observationes criticae (Jena 1848. 4.) and Quaest. C. (Jena 1849. 4.). J. v. G. Fröhlich, Conjectures, Munich. Trans. l. l. V. p. 233—275 (München 1849), and on some poems, ib. VI p. 257—279. F. Ritschl, Emend. C. trias, Bonn 1857. 4. R. Klotz, Emend. C., Lips. 1859. 4. J. Pohl, Lectiones C. I. Euskirchen (Münster) 1860. 8. II. Sigmaringen 1866. 4. P. Böhme, Quaest. C., Bonn 1862. Th. Bergk, Emend. C., Halle 1864. 4. L. Schwabe, Coniecturae C., Dorpat 1864. 4. H. A. Koch, in the Symbola phil., Bonn. p. 315—320. G. F. Rettig Catulliana II. Bern 1870. 17 pp. 4. J. Mähly in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 103, p. 341—350.

13. Special treatises on isolated poems. F. Hand, c. LV restit., Jena 1848. 4. C. Pleitner, on Catullus' epithalamia, Dillingen 1858. 104 pp. 4. on c. 64 (Epithal. Pelei et Thet.) spicileg. animadv. by Corn. Müller (Hamburg 1836. 4.), M. Haupt (Berlin 1855. 4. p. 7—13), F. Ritschl (de nonnullis locis, Bonn 1857. 4.), E. Fritze (recens. ill., Halberstadt 1863. 4). A. Weise, on the criticism of Catullus c. 68, 65, 101. Naumburg 1863. 4. critical and exegetical observations on c. 68, Zeitz 1869.

212. Independently of the political speeches which were then almost regularly published and were a rich mine of periodical literature, the hostile factions impugned each other also in separate pamphlets. M. Varro, C. Scribonius Curio, and A. Caecina wrote such pamphlets against Caesar. Others again used the events of the day for ventilating their party views on them. Especially funeral speeches (laudationes) were used for these purposes. Cato's death at Utica gave rise to quite a literature of its own: Cicero, M. Brutus, M. Fadius Gallus, and Munatius wrote in praise of him, but

against him went A. Hirtius, Caesar himself, Metellus Scipio, and at a later time Augustus. In the same way Cato's daughter, Porcia, became on the occasion of her death the subject of laudations by M. Varro, Lollius, and Cicero. Some employed a metrical form (epigrams and lampoons).

1. On Varro's *Τριχάρανος* in 694 see Appian. b. c. II 9: *καί τις αὐτῶν* (of the triumvirs Pompey, Caesar and Crassus) *τήνδε τὴν συμφροσύνην συγγραφεύς, Οὐάρρων, ἑνὶ βιβλίῳ περιλαβὼν ἐπέγραψε Τριχάρανον.* On Curio's pamphlet in a. 695 see above 140, 6. A. Caecina see above 186, 13. On the poetical attacks against Caesar see above 209, 6. 210, 7. 211, 5.

2. On the pamphlets called forth by the death of Cato (a. 708) see Wartmann, Life of Cato of Utica (Zürich 1858) p. 145 sqq. On Cicero's Cato see above 167, 6. As a supplement M. Brutus wrote his own: see above 209, 1. For Hirtius' Anticato see above 184, 2; on Caesar's 182, 7. The panegyric of M. Fadius Gallus was probably published in July or August 709: see Cic. ad fam. VII 24 extr. cf. 25, 1. Cato's friend Munatius *σύγγραμμα περὶ Κάτωνος ἐξέδωκε,* Plut. Cat. min. 37 cf. 25. On the other hand Metellus Scipio had in Cato's lifetime published *βιβλίον βλασφημίας κατέχον τοῦ Κάτωνος,* ib. 57. On Augustus' work see Suetonius Aug. 85: multa varii generis prosa oratione composuit, ex quibus nonnulla in coetu familiarium velut in auditorio recitavit, sicut Rescripta Bruto de Catone, quae volumina cum iam senior ex magna parte legisset, fatigatus Tiberio tradidit perlegenda.

3. Porcia, the daughter of Cato Uticensis and wife of M. Brutus. Her illness is mentioned by Brutus ad Cic. I 17, 7; and when she had resolved in her husband's absence *διὰ νόσον καταλιπεῖν τὸν βίον* (Plut. Brut. 53), Brutus was put out with his friends at Rome for not having prevented her (*ὡς ἀμεληθείσης ὑπ' αὐτῶν,* Plut. l. l.) A letter of condolence of Cicero to Brutus ad Brut. I 9. The relation that after the death of her husband she swallowed burning coals, is an invention of later rhetoricians. Cic. ad Att. XIII 48, 2 (a. 709): laudationem Porciae tibi misi correctam. . . et velim M. Varronis et Lollii mittas laudationem. Lollii utique; nam illam legi; volo tamen regustare.

4. Epigrams on political events see above 31, 2; Iambics 33, 2. Trochaic lines (see above 11, 3), e. g. (on the death of Crassus): postquam Crassus carbo factust, Carbo (or carbo) crassus factus est (Eichenfeld and Endlicher, Anal. Vindob.) Cic. ad Q. fr. II 3, 2 (a. 698): cum omnia maledicta, versus denique obscenissimi in Clodium et Clodiam dicerentur.

213. The daily news was after a. 695 regularly published in the acta, the minutes of the Senate in the acta senatus, and the public and private events in the acta populi or acta

diurna. The latter were a kind of official journal, with a specially appointed editor; they were daily exhibited in public, copied by entrepreneurs and sold by them. We do not possess any genuine fragments of the latter kind of acta.

1. Sueton. Caes. 20: inito honore (of consulship, a. 695 = 59 B. C.) primus omnium instituit ut tam senatus quam populi diurna acta conficerent et publicarentur. Acta of itself denotes the transactions themselves, especially those of magistrates, and as an abbreviation (instead of commentarii actorum) it means a written account of them. Before Caesar, only the decrees of the Senate used to be written down and sometimes published; but Caesar published also the transactions of the Senate. To take minutes of them was the constant practice of the whole Imperial period (even A. D. 438 we hear of gesta in senatu urbis Romae de recipiendo codice Theodosiano), but the publication was prohibited by Augustus (Sues. Aug. 36: auctor et aliarum rerum fuit, in quis, ne acta senatus publicarentur). These minutes contained also the motions made in the Senate, the reports and despatches arrived, in the Imperial period also the speeches of the Emperors read by the Quaestor, and the acclamations of the Senators. The minutes were written down at first by Senators specially charged with this by the Consul and subsequently the Emperor, afterwards by the curator actorum senatus, after Hadrian by the ab actis senatus, an office standing midway between the quaestorship and edileship (or tribuneship). These acta senatus were kept in the imperial archives (tabularium), where they seem to have been accessible only to Senators and for certain purposes, or in separate parts of the public libraries which were accessible only by special permission of the praefectus urbis. Some transactions of the Senate were admitted into the acta populi and thereby became generally accessible. E. Hübner in Fleckeisen's jahrb. Suppl. III p. 564—594, and a brief account by W. Rein in Pauly's Encycl. I 1, p. 132 sq. 147 sq. A list of the resolutions of the Senate known to us (senatus consulta) see in Rein l. l. VI 1, p. 1033 sq. and in Hübner l. l. p. 622—627.

2. The acta diurna populi are also called acta diurna or acta populi rom. or acta populi or acta publica, acta urbana, rerum urbanarum acta, acta urbis diurna populi rom., or diurna (e. g. Iuv. VI 483) or acta (e. g. Iuv. II 136) briefly; the Greek writers merely call them τὰ κοινὰ ὑπομνήματα or ὑπομνήματα. The publication of the news of the day had been a private affair before Caesar, and even afterwards this was carried on privately: but Caesar made it regular and official. This was so much suited to the requirements of travellers and such as lived abroad, nay even of the very inhabitants of the huge capital, that the publication was continued uninterruptedly and did not cease until the seat of the Empire was transferred to Constantinople. The contents of these acta were partly official (such as events concerning the reigning family, decrees of the Emperors and

of the magistrates, decrees or discussions of the Senate, and other facts interesting to the general public), partly private, containing family news of all kinds, advertisements of births, marriages, divorces, deaths etc. communicated to the Editor, frequently in a very subjective tone (e. g. of a widower, saucius pectus Quintil. IX 3, 17). Births had to be registered at the office of the praefectus aerarii and this was made obligatory by M. Antoninus the Philosopher. The praefectus aerarii seems to have sent communications to the Editor of the journal, some mere statistic notes, some again special mentions of cases concerning well-known families, if indeed such advertisements (in the acta) were not rather left to the discretion of these families. Just as people used to copy the annals (above 66), these acta were multiplied by scribes and communicated to their subscribers. After some time had elapsed, the original was transferred to the archives, where it could be used for literary purposes. The acta Muciani and Acholii were extracts from the originals. On account of their voluminous extent, the acta can scarcely have existed in private libraries, and even at the very first they may sometimes have been read in extracts. See E. Hübner l. l. p. 594—622, and a short account by Rein l. l. p. 134—137.

3. Other treatises on the acta senatus and acta populi. J. Lipsius' Excursus A on Tac. A. V. F. C. Schlosser in the Archive of History: edited by himself and Bercht (Frankf. 1830) p. 80—106. R. E. Prutz, de fontibus quos in conscribendis rebus inde a Tiberio usque ad mortem Neronis gestis auctores veteres secuti videantur (Halle 1838) p. 14—21. V. Leclerc, des journaux chez les Romains, Paris 1838. W. A. Schmidt, in his Journal of Historical study I. p. 303—355. G. E. F. Lieberkühn, de diurnis Rom. actis (Weimar 1840) and Epistola critica ad Le-Clercium (Lips. 1844). J. W. A. Renasen, de diurnis aliisque Rom. actis, Gröningen 1857. C. Zell, Vacation-writings, New Series, I. (Heidelberg 1857) p. 1—108.

4. The eleven fragments of acta populi first published by Pighius (1615) in his Annales II p. 378 and commonly called fragmenta Dodwelliana from their principal defender (Dodwell, Praelect. acad. Oxon. 1692, p. 665—691), are a forgery of the 15th century. Against them see especially P. Wesseling, Probabilia (Franeker 1731) p. 354—385, and J. A. Ernesti, in the first Excursus to his edition of Suetonius (Lips. 1748). But Lieberkühn (especially in his Vindiciae librorum iniuria suspectorum, Lips. 1844, p. 1—100 = Epistola . . . ad La-Clercium) attempted to defend their genuineness; against him see H. Heinze, de spuriis actorum diurnorum fragmentis I, Greifswald 1860. See also C. Zell, l. l. p. 109—150.

214. A peculiar position midway between criticizing and merely relating daily literature is held by letters of which we possess a considerable number in this period in the collections forming part of Cicero's works, most of them by Cicero himself, but many also by other contemporaries.

1. On letters see above 33, 3.

2. On Caesar's letters see above 182, 8; on those of M. Brutus above 209, 1.

3. On the Ciceronian collections see above 170 and 171. Besides Cicero's own letters they contain letters by his brother Quintus (above 177, 3), by his son (ad fam. XVI 21. 25), M. Brutus (above 171, 4, cf. 209, 1), Ser. Sulpicius (fam. IV 5. 12), Marcellus (ib. IV 11), Q. Metelus Celer (above 211, 2,, Q. Metellus Nepos (ad fam. V 3), Vatinius (ib. V 9. 10), L. Lucceius (V 14), A. Caecina (above 186, 13), A. Pompeius Bithynicus (fam. VI 16), M'. Curius (fam. VII 29), M. Caelius Rufus (above 206, 6), Dolabella (fam. IX 9), Munatius Plancus (above 206, 6), Ser. Sulpicius Galba (fam. X 30), C. Asinius Pollio (fam. X 31. 32. 33), Lepidus (fam. X 34. 35), D. Brutus (above 209, 2), C. Matius (above 205, 3), C. Cassius (above 209, 3), Cassius Parmensis (above 209, 4), P. Lentulus (fam. XII 14. 15), C. Trebonius (above 209, 5), M. Cato (above 188, 2). Enclosed in letters of Atticus we get letters of Cn. Pompey (above 158, 6), Caesar (above 182, 8), Balbus (above 184, 2), M. Antony (above 206, 3).

215. Not one of the Inscriptions of a. 670—710 is in Saturnian metre. Among the prose-inscriptions the most important are the lex Cornelia de XX quaestoribus of a. 673, the Senatus consultum de Asclepiade, Polystrato, Menisco in amicorum formulam referendis of a. 676, the lex Antonia de Termessibus, perhaps c. a. 683, the lex Rubria de civitate Galliae cisalpinae c. 705, and the lex Iulia municipalis of a. 709 v. c.

1. For the undated metrical inscriptions of the 7th century see above 126.

2. The lex Cornelia of Sulla dictator, perhaps of a. 673 (cf. Tac. A. XI 22) first printed 1560; in Ritschl, P. L. M. E. XXIX, C. I. lat. I, 202. p. 108—110. The brass tablet which was dug up under the ruins of the temple of Saturn at Rome, bears in the margin the inscription VIII de XX Q, (uaestoribus) and is only part of a larger composition.

3. The SC. by which Asclepiades Philini f. Clazomenius, Polystratus Polyarci f. Carystius, Meniscus Irenaei f. Milesius are declared viri boni et ameici is written in Latin and Greek: see Ritschl tab. XXX, C. lat. I 203 p. 110—113.

4. The lex Antonia of the popular tribune C. Antonius M. f. confirms the independence of the town of Termessus maior in Pisidia: Ritschl tab. XXXI, C. I. lat. I 204. p. 114 sq.

5. The lex Rubria, discovered at Veleia a. 1760 and much commented on, recently by Th. Mommsen in Bekker's and Muther's Annals of German jurisprudence, II p. 319—334, edited by Ritschl, legis Ru-

briae pars superstes (Berlin 1851. 4.), and in P. L. M. E. tab. XXXII; C. I. lat. I 205. p. 115—119.

6. The lex Julia municipalis of Caesar (also called tabulae Heracleenses from the place where it was found a. 1732 sq.), intended to regulate the legal state of municipal towns, was originally Greek, but there are two tablets with a Latin translation on the reverse. The Latin text is given by Ritschl P. L. M. E. tab. XXXIII and XXXIV, in C. I. lat. I 206. p. 119—125. The most important treatise on it is by Savigny, Miscellaneous Writings III p. 279—412. A lex municipalis is also contained in the lamina Tudertina and the lamina Florentina which, however, belong to the Augustan period: see C. I. lat. I p. 263.

7. The rogatio Hirtia (of a. 708?) is mentioned in the brass tablet C. I. lat. I 627 sq. p. 184.

8. Among the dated inscriptions of a. 670—710 (C. I. lat. I 573—626) we should especially mention those of the time of Sulla (nr. 584—586 and 587—589, of populus Laodicensis af Lyco, populus Ephesius and *Λυκίων τὸ κοινόν*), the mile-stone of M. Terentius Varro Lucullus (Pauly's Enc. IV p. 1074 sq. nr. 9), nr. 583; the Campanian votive tablet in which in servom Iunonis Gaurae contulerunt (a. 683), and the inscription of Furfo (nr. 603, of a. 696), the latter especially remarkable for its incorrect Latin style.

9. 'Glandes' with inscriptions bearing upon the siege of Asculum (a. 664 sq.) in C. I. lat. I 644—680, p. 189—192; a glans Mundensis (a. 709) ib. p. 192; siege of Perusia (a. 713 sq.) ib. 682—705, p. 192—194, the latter containing some coarse jokes of the soldiers, e. g. pete culum Octaviani; L. Antoni calve, Fulvia, culum pandite; L. Antoni calve, peristi C. Caesarus victoria; esureis et me celas. G. Eroli, Bull. dell' inst. arch. 1871, 4.

10. Dated tesserae gladiatoriae of the years 669—710 in C. I. lat. I 717—738, and of 721—827 v. c. ib. 739—774. 776b.

11. Bricks with dates from municipal towns, e. g. Veleia, in the years 678—743, C. I. lat. I p. 202 sq.

12. 'Devotiones' of the republican period: C. I. lat. I 818—820, p. 208 sq.

13. Sepulchral inscription on L. Manneius Q. (libertus) medicus. *φυσικὸς οἰνοδότης* according to the method of Asclepiades of Prusa (W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. I 2. p. 1845, n. 13), probably in the time of Pompey C. I. lat. I 1256.

14. A jocular mural inscription at Pompeii: Urnannia pereit de taberna. sei quis eam retulerit dabuntur etc. in C. I. lat. I 1254. p. 249. Another found in the same town and bearing an accurate date: C. Pumidius Dipilus heic fuit a. d. V. nonas Octobreis M. Lepid. Q. Catul. cos. (a. 676), ib. I 590.

B. The Augustan period (a. 711—767 v. c.)

216. The battle of Actium and the death of Mark Antony terminated the century of the Civil Wars: Octavianus was now the monarch acknowledged by all. But he was prudent enough to avoid the cliffs on which his great predecessor had been wrecked, and did not openly discard the traditions of the republic: their exterior forms were retained, but gradually changed so as to become the vehicles of imperial power. In this way the Augustan period presents a twofold aspect in containing the decay of the old, and the formation of the new institutions, the death of the Republic and the development of the Monarchy. This ambiguous character is plainly perceptible in the first men of the time: Asinius Pollio, Messala, and Horace fought and played a part in the time of the Republic, and Virgil had in his early years written poetry in the manner of Catullus. But taking it altogether, Octavianus' task was greatly facilitated by Fortune. Most of the enemies of Monarchy had been carried off by death, and those who survived had no vigour and courage, nor were they backed by the people who were tired of the long struggles. Cleopatra's disgraceful sway over M. Antony led many into the camp of Octavianus, e. g. M. Messala, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (Cons. 722), L. Sempronius Atratinus (Cons. 720)[1]). One after the other made his peace with the new state of things[2]). The jurists Cascellius and Labeo were the most refractory, but as they were comparatively harmless, they were allowed to do as they pleased, though the more pliable Ateius Capito was favoured in preference. Asinius Pollio seems never to have got over the comparative insignificance to which the Monarchy had condemned him, but his courage evaporated in mere taunts. Horace also kept long aloof from the Monarchy: but he was sincerely reconciled to it afterwards.

---

1) Horace also used this motive to account for his political conversion necessitated by his connexion with Maecenas; cf. Epo. 9. O. I 37. For Virgil see Aen. VIII 688.

2) Sen. de clem. I 10, 1 of Augustus: Sallustium et Cocceios et Deillios et totam cohortem primae admissionis ex adversariorum castris conscripsit. iam Domitios, Messalas, Asinios, Cicerones, et quidquid floris in civitate erat, clementiae suae debebat.

Matius, Trebatius Testa, and L. Varius were favourable to Caesar's heir from the very beginning; Publilius Syrus, Ticidas, and Virgil were not obnoxious politically. Munatius Plancus worshipped success. The longer Monarchy existed, the more freely it disposed of rewards and punishments, the more successful was it, and at last there was quite a rivalry in toadying. [1]) Such characters as Labeo and Labienus were soon considered crotchety: they were not understood and ridiculed. The official hypocrisy in continuing the old forms and names in spite of the complete change of their meaning, breathed a spirit of untruth into the upper classes and the literature, which was further increased by the rise of empty declamations. Another result of the hypocrisy of the government itself appears in the increased sensitiveness of the monarch as to unwelcome revelations and in the exertions made by him to bury the past in oblivion and consolidate the new institutions. Owing to these tendencies, literature was partly hemmed in and narrowed, partly degraded to a servile 'instrumentum regni.'

Eloquence had chiefly to suffer from all this: though hemmend in even under Caesar, it was now oppressed to much greater extent. Public life became extinct, all political business passed into the hands of the monarch, the meetings of the people became very scarce and unimportant, the courts were henceforth influenced by other regards and adhered merely to the letter of the law. Only the transactions of the Senate and the civil lawsuits before the Court of the Centumviri offered a field to the exertions of orators; but the Senate was cramped up by the presence of the Emperor and the servility of the great majority of its members, and very frequently all discussion was cut off by decisions and orders from the prince: even the insignificant power of the Centumviri was gradually encroached upon by the growing power of the praefectus urbi. The two orators, who survived the

1) Tac. A. I 2 of Augustus: ubi militem donis, populum annona, cunctos dulcedine otii pellexit, insurgere paulatim, munia senatus, magistratuum, legum in se trahere, nullo adversante, cum ferocissimi per acies aut proscriptione cecidissent, ceteri nobilium, quanto quis servitio promptior, opibus et honoribus extollerentur ac novis ex rebus aucti tuta et praesentia quam vetera et periculosa mallent.

republic, Asinius Pollio and M. Messala, lost their ground completely; those who did not prefer silence, were obliged to submit to the new ways, and to become elegant speakers without real aims and subjects, in a word, mere declaimers.[1])

Another branch of literature which had attained a high perfection under the Republic, we mean Historical composition, suffered greatly under this change.[2]) At first M. Brutus was freely defended in Memoirs written by his friends, Messala and Volumnius, but after the battle of Actium Asinius Pollio soon perceived that it was advisable to leave his work on the Civil Wars unfinished. Contemporary history was impeded by the ceasing of publicity and the retention of public documents.[3]) To a still greater extent the possibility of pronouncing unbiassed judgments on historical characters was interfered with. If a historian did not choose to treat history merely from the dynastic point of view, it became necessary to turn to distant neutral parts, as Pompeius Trogus did, or to study historical composition in the imaginative and discursive style of Livy. The Greeks felt now greatly attracted towards historical labours. Their nationality kept them from the political broils, their language precluded them from gaining direct influence upon the nation at large, they easily adapted themselves to the existing state of things and availed themselves of it: hence they found at Rome a fertile field of literary activity. Besides Timagenes and Nicolaus of Damask there wrote under Augustus and partly at Rome Diodorus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Strabo, Iuba, Parthenius, and others; also the rhetoricians Caecilius of Cale Acte, Hermagoras, Apollodorus and his pupil Moschus, Arius, Crato, Lesbonax, Athenodorus, and the poet Crinagoras.

---

1) See above 37 with note 1.

2) Cf. above 33, 1. Sen. III. p. 437 Hse: ab initio bellorum civilium, unde primum veritas retro abiit. Suet. Claud. 41: historiam in adulescentia, hortante T. Livio, . . scribere adgressus est . . coepitque a pace civili, cum sentiret neque libere neque vere sibi de superioribus tradendi potestatem relictam, correptus saepe et a matre (Antonia) et ab avia (Octavia). Sen. Controv. II. p. 155, 9 sq. should therefore be taken with certain restrictions: tanta sub divo Augusto libertas fuit ut praepotenti tunc M. Agrippae non defuerint qui ignobilitatem exprobrarent.

3) See above 213, 1.

As concerns Jurisprudence, Augustus knew well how to gain it for the monarchy by rendering the permission of giving juridical consultations (until then merely left to the confidence of the public) dependent on the consent of the prince,[1]) and also granting to these 'reponsa' such importance as was formerly attributed to the edict of the praetor[2]). In the possession of these privileges, the jurists devoted themselves to the cultivation of their science, and even then the personal enmity of Labeo and Capito laid the foundation of the two schools of the Sabinians, being the adherents of Capito, and the Proculians who followed Antistius Labeo.[3])

The extinction of public political life was still more favourable to the development of art-poetry and erudition.

Though formerly the Romans had admitted literary activity only in the second rank to fill up their leisure-time, *otium*, now that the *negotia* of the republican time had been so greatly reduced, it became with many a serious life-task. Poetry especially was now zealously studied as an art[4]), and

---

1) Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 47 (49): ante tempora Augusti publice respondendi ius non a principibus dabatur, sed qui fiduciam studiorum suorum habebant consulentibus respondebant. . . primus Divus Augustus, ut maior iuris auctoritas haberetur, constituit ut ex auctoritate eius responderent.

2) Gaius Inst. I 7: responsa prudentium sunt sententiae et opiniones eorum quibus permissum est iura condere. quorum omnium si in unum sententiae concurrant, id quod ita sentiunt legis vicem optinet. Sen. Epist. 94, 27: iurisconsultorum valent responsa, etiam si ratio non redditur.

3) Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 47: hi duo (Labeo and Capito) primum veluti diversas sectas fecerunt; nam Ateius Capito in his quae ei tradita fuerant perseverabat, Labeo ingenii qualitate et fiducia doctrinae, qui et ceteris operis sapientiae operam dederat, plurima innovare instituit. From this Labeo might appear as a rationalist, Capito as a positivist: but Rudorff (Hist. of Roman Law I p. 182) justly observes that the Sabiniaus were in favour of the new state of things and of the limitation of the old civil private autonomy, while the Proculians upheld the old foundations of the law: a difference which lost its importance, after Hadrian had caused the existing law to be codified by Julianus. See Bremer, die Rechtslehren (1868) p. 68—71.

4) The making of verses was actually studied; see above 197, 1. Martial IV 61, 3 sq.: in schola poetarum dum fabulamur.

hellenic polish of form was earnestly striven after. The form of the poems became of greater importance, as the range of subjects was narrowed and interfered with by various reasons. Prosody and metre were still treated with the rigour gained at the close of the Ciceronian period, and even new forms were attempted; elision which was a peculiarity of popular usage was much limited.[1]) But the gain in art was a loss in popularity: poetry was written for a select circle of friends and connoisseurs and for posterity; and sneers at the people plainly show that there was no sympathy between the writers and their nation.[2]) But the greater the estrangement between the poets and the nation, the more were they driven to the upper classes: these art-poets became court-poets, and this caused a further increase of the disfavour in which they were held. Hence the Augustan poets, especially Horace, are continually striving against a hostile current in favour of the old national poets, a tendency naturally connected with the general dissatisfaction at the political aspect of the time. Not until the older generation had died off, could the new school gain firm ground.[3])

Independently of this general assistance derived from the political situation of the time, the representatives of the new school of poetry were also assisted by the rulers themselves, partly from personal love for the subject, partly from political calculation. Augustus did not omit to encourage the poets[4]), and his favourites became the centres of literary circles which, though not without rivalry and quarrels[5]), were held

---

1) L. Müller, de re metr. p. 74 and 281 sq. W. Corssen, Vocalism II. p. 199 sq. Especially Ovid, the author of the Culex, Gratius Faliscus, and Manilius are very strict in this respect.

2) malignum spernere volgus, Hor. O. II 16, 39 sq. Cf. III 1, 1: odi profanum volgus et arceo. Ps. Vergil. Catal. 11, 64: pingui nil mihi cum populo. Ps. Tibull. III 3, 20: falso plurima volgus amat.

3) Hor. O. IV 3, 14 sqq. (et iam dente minus mordeor invido).

4) Suet. Aug. 89: ingenia saeculi sui omnibus modis fovit.

5) Cf. Sen. Controv. II 12, 12 sq. p. 154 sq. Bu. Some thing like this is reflected in Agrippa's judgment on Virgil's poetical manner. Donatus' vita Verg. 44 (62): M. Vipsanius a Maecenate eum suppositum appellabat novae cacozeliae repertore (Var. repertorem), non tumidae nec exilis, sed ex communibus verbis atque ideo latentis. On the other hand, see the favourable opinions on Virgil by Maecenas in Sen. suas. q. 6 sp. 17, 26 Bu.

together and influenced by their common relations to Augustus. First of these should be mentioned the circle of Maecenas, in which Horace was not the oldest, but the most distinguished member on account of his independent character, acute mind and poetical talent. Other members of the same circle were Virgil and L. Varius, Plotius Tucca, Quintilius Varus, Aristius Fuscus, Domitius Marsus, Melissus, and others[1]), and at a later time when Horace had almost entirely withdrawn from Rome, Propertius[2]) joined it, who is never mentioned by Horace. This whole circle was in favour of the existing government, and all its members were gradually imbued with these views. The circle of Messala was less forward in politics, and in the writings of the principal member of it, Tibullus, the name of Augustus does not occur a single time. Other members of it were Messala's brother, Pedius Poplicola, Aemilius Macer, Valgius Rufus, Lygdamus, Sulpica, the author of Ciris and of the elegy on Messala,[3]) and in part also Ovid.[4]) Asinius Pollio was chiefly conspicuous as a critic, and on account of his repeated opposition to the government only the most independent members of other circles, e. g. Horace, ventured to join him. When Augustus was left alone and no longer under the necessity of putting restraint upon himself, having already gained a firm footing; when all his friends and advisers had preceded him in death and he had become sensitive and intolerant like an old man as he was, then and only then some acts occurred that remind us of that Octavianus who signed the proscriptions, and then he dealt summarily with obnoxious men like

1) Cf. Hor. S. I 10, 81 sqq. Ep. I 3. See also Ovid Trist. IV 10, 41 sqq. Martial VIII 56.

2) Propertius himself never mentions Horace, but alludes to him in several passages; see below. Ovid also passes him over in his enumeration A. A. III 333 sqq., and contradicts him (S. II 5, 10 sqq.) ib. II 271 sqq., and not until his death does he allow him the somewhat scanty praise: tenuit nostras numerosus Horatius auris (Trist. IV 10, 49 sq.). It may be that Horace occasionally showed his mental and social superiority in a way offensive to young men.

3) Vergil. Catal. 11.

4) Cf. ex Pont. 1 7, 28 sq. to Messalinus: nec tuus est genitor nos infitiatus amicos, hortator studii causaque faxque mei. Trist. IV 4, 27 sqq.

Labienus, Cassius Severus, and Ovid. In his earlier years men of talent had rather to beware of his kindness lest it should turn them from their own tracks. His care for scholars was shown by the forming of public libraries, the first of which was founded by Asinius Pollio after his Dalmatian triumph (a. 715); then came the Octaviana (a. 721)[1]) and the library by the temple of the Palatine Apollo (a. 726).

As a result of this favour designedly shown to literary activity we meet in the Augustan period with an immense number of real and would-be poets,[2]) even among the female sex (e. g. Sulpicia, Cynthia and Perilla), and the recitations of literary productions before a select audience (though not long afterwards any body that liked to come was welcome[3]), also the declamations, gradually became substitutes in the place of the old meetings of the people. These *recitationes* may indeed have had some relation to the old 'collegium poetarum'[4]): but Asinius Pollio was the first who used them to make up for the loss of his public sphere[5]), and indeed they agreed so well with the spirit of the time, that they never afterwards went out of use and soon became the decisive test of the success of writers, though venal applause also served to deceive many inferior talents as to their value.

Among the various branches of poetry, epic poetry was especially cultivated and perfected by Virgil, together with the kindred branches of didactic poetry and idyls. In reference to contemporary events, epic poetry naturally assumed a panegyric character[6]). Satire was regenerated by Horace, but

---

1) Dio XLIX 43 extr. By the theatre of Marcelllus.

2) Hor. Ep. II 1, 108 sqq.

3) Cf. Sen. Controv. X. praef. 4 (p. 292 Bu.): T. Labienus .. declamavit non quidem populo, sed egregie. non admittebat populum, et quia nondum haec consuetudo erat inducta et quia putabat turpe ac frivolae iactationis.

4) See above 82, 6. 119, 3.

5) Sen. Controv. IV. praef. 2 (p. 375 Bu.): Pollio Asinius nunquam admissa multitudine declamavit (see above n. 3), nec illi ambitio in studiis defuit: primus enim omnium Romanorum advocatis hominibus scripta sua recitavit. On the style of these recitations cf. Tac. dial. 9, 17 sqq. Mich. Plin. Ep. VIII 12. Iuvenal. VII 40 sqq. Suet. Claud. 41. K. Lehrs, Popular Essays, (1856) p. 175 sqq.

6) O. Haube, de carminibus epicis saeculi Augusti, Breslau 1870. 36 pp.

deprived of its original basis, liberty and freedom, it was soon limited to personal, literary and social subjects and soon afterwards disappeared from the arena altogether, though the poetical epistles of a later period were merely an innocent reproduction of it. Lyric poetry now attained to its highest perfection. Melic poetry found in Horace a representative of great maturity of judgment, extensive culture, rigorous mastery over form, and who kept clear of the mistakes of preceding poets who chose the Alexandrines for their models — yet it may be confessed, that Horace did not possess an original talent for poetry. The elegiac poets did not quite leave the Alexandrine models, but surpassed them in spirit and vivacity. Cornelius Gallus was the first to cultivate erotic elegy, and Tibullus subsequently imparted to his poems the lucidity and loveliness of the productions of the Greek mind. Propertius enriched this department by introducing numerous new subjects, and in Ovid we meet with an ease and perfection of form which seem to vie with the naughtiness of the contents. The drama, however, did not succeed. In its alienation from contemporary history, tragedy became erudite and flat; comedy could not prosper owing to the seriousness of the past and the sensitiveness of the present time; the trabeata of Melissus remained isolated. The effete multitude preferred gorgeous scenery and voluptuous pantomimes, and even Maecenas favoured them; Aesopus was now succeeded by Pylades, and Roscius by Bathyllus.

Even prose lost ground in this period. Livy, indeed, was a writer of the first rank, as far as style is concerned; but even in him, the poetical colouring of his style showed a certain deviation from severe classicality which indicated the approach of the silver age. The other prose-writers are most of them rather intent upon their subjects than their style: for example, Julius Hyginus, Verrius Flaccus, Sinnius Capito, Vitruvius Pollio, and the Jurists Antistius Labeo, Ateius Capito, and others. Philosophy lacked neither motive, nor interest. Augustus himself wrote Adhortationes ad philosophiam, and Livy composed philosophical treatises. Virgil intended to give himself up to philosophy, and Horace actually did so;

1) See above p. 232.

the author of Ciris was an enthusiast for it. But only Sextius was what may be called a technical writer on philosophy, and he wrote in Greek. The others merely wrote of practical philosophy, and most of them started with the conviction of the emptiness of all human splendour and wisdom. From this they drew, according to their disposition and humour, either serious or loose conclusions, but arrived always at the result that it would be vain to struggle against the existing state of things and against the religion of the time. What was in reality the effect of outward necessity, i. e. entire abstinence of public activity, was now adopted by the majority as their free choice, and the principle of egotism was developed to a system of subjectivism and a kind of practical philosophy which finds its most eloquent and straightforward representative in Horace. By this voluntary recognition of the actual barriers the literature of this time assumed the character of egotism and resignation.

Altogether the equality of the influencing circumstances causes a certain uniformity among the writers of the Augustan period. In its beginning there was indeed a difference between the older generation whose youth had passed under the Republic and during the Civil Wars, and the younger generation that had entirely grown up under the Monarchy; but very soon peace and a mild despotism extended their relaxing influence over all alike, and both young and old zealously praise the happiness of an iners vita, the slumber by the side of the murmuring brook[1]); they wasted time and art in amorous dallying with members of the demi-monde; in moments of surfeit they longed for the healthy simplicity of nature, and endeavoured to stifle the sense of their lost liberty and self-respect by pompously proclaiming their immortality. But so clear a mind as Horace received from his quiet insight into the hollowness and hypocrisy of the whole period a trait showing itself sometimes as mild irony, sometimes as sadness, and also as deep-seated disgust.

This difference of the two generations was most pronounced in the field of eloquence, in which the few orators who survived the downfall of the Republic were succeeded in the

1) See W. Teuffel on Horace S. II 6, 61. p. 164.

younger generation only by rhetoricians: in these the memory of the olden time was at first still alive, as it was in Seneca and partly in Seneca the elder; but the other coryphees of declamation and rhetoric in the Augustan period, such men as Porcius Latro, Albucius Silus, Iunius Gallio, Cestius Pius, Rutilius Lupus and others, can be scarcely distinguished in their manner from those of the succeeding century.

1. K. Höck, Roman History from the decay of the Republic etc. I 2 (Brunswick 1843) p. 341—370. A. E. Egger, examen critique des historiens anciens de la vie et du règne d'Auguste (Paris 1844), especially p. 59—74. F. D. Gerlach, the age of Augustus, Basle 1849. A. W. Schmidt, A History of the liberty of thought and belief in the first century of the Imperial period (Berlin 1847) p. 35—55. 260 sqq. 290 sqq. (an exaggerated account). C. Merivale, history of the Romans IV (London 1862). p. 538—587. G. Bernhardy, History of Roman Literature, fourth edition (Halle 1867) p. 247—277. C. Peter, Hist. of Rome III (1867) p. 95—134. C. Campe, Literary tendencies and conditions at Rome in the time of Horace, Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 103, p. 463—479. 537—554.

I. The leading men.

217. All the leading men of this time took an active share in literature. Augustus (691—767) wrote several works in metrical form, even more in prose, especially in the shape of Memoirs, and a survey of his own reign most of which we possess in the Monumentum Ancyranum. For a long time afterwards letters by him were in circulation. Maecenas (685—746) was notorious for his artificial style and also wrote trifles in various metres. Agrippa (691—742) wrote Memoirs, and under his superintendence the survey of the Roman Empire was completed. He embodied the results of these labours in his commentarii and caused a map to be made of the whole Empire.

1. C. Octavius C. f., born 23 September 691 = 63 b. Chr., adopted by Caesar in his last will and hence called Caesar Octavianus. The battle of Actium was Sept. 2, 723. The title of Augustus he bore from the beginning of 727. He died August 19, 767 = 14 A. D. K. Höck, Roman History from the decay of the Republic I 1, Brunsw. 1841, p. 219—426. 2 (Brunsw. 1843) p. 1—121. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. V. (1847.) p. 827—844. Beulé, Auguste, sa famille et ses amis, Paris 1867. 363 pp. On his works see: Augusti imperatoris fragmenta cur. I. A. Fabricius, Hamburg 1727. 4. A. Weichert, de imp. Caesaris Augusti scriptis commentatio I. II. Grimma 1835 sq., and Imp. Caesaris Augusti operum reliquiae, Grimma 1841—46. 4.

2. Sueton. Aug. 84: eloquentiam studiaque liberalia ab aetate prima et cupide et laboriosissime exercuit. . . neque in senatu neque apud populum neque apud milites locutus est umquam nisi meditata et composita oratione. . . pronuntiabat dulci et proprio quodam oris sono. 86: genus eloquendi secutus est elegans et temperatum, vitatis sententiarum ineptiis atque concinnitate, . . praecipuamque curam duxit sensum animi quam apertissime exprimere. Tac. A. XIII 3: Augusto prompta ac profluens quaeque deceret principem eloquentia fuit. Fronto Epist. p. 123 N.: Augustum . . eleganter et latine, linguae etiamtum integro lepore potius quam dicendi ubertate praeditum puto. He pronounced a parentation on his avia Iulia in his twelfth year (Suet. 8. Quintil. XII 6, 1. Nicol. Dam. Aug. 3), on M. Marcellus a. 731 (Dio LIII 30. Serv. Aen. I 712), on Agrippa a. 742 (Dio LIV 28), on his sister Octavia a. 743 (Dio LIV 35. Suet. 61), Drusus a. 745 (Suet. Claud. 1. Liv. CXL. Dio LV 2).

3. Suet. 85: multa varii generis prosa oratione composuit, ex quibus nonnulla in coetu familiarium velut in auditorio recitavit, sicut Rescripta Bruto de Catone (see above 212, 2), . . item Hortationes ad philosophiam et aliqua de vita sua, quam tredecim libris (cf. n. 5), Cantabrico tenus bello nec ultra, exposuit. Plut. compar. Demosth. c. Cic. 3: ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Ἀγρίππαν καὶ Μαικήναν ὑπομνήμασιν; cf. Brut. 27. 41 (ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν). Suet. Claud. 1: nec contentus elogium tumulo eius (of Drusus) versibus a se compositis insculpsisse, etiam vitae memoriam prosa oratione composuit (Augustus). Quotations from his letters in Suet. Aug. 69. 71. 76. 86. Claud. 4. gramm. 16. Tac. dial. 13 (to Virgil, see below 224, 1). Letters to Horace are mentioned in Suetonius' life of the poet. A letter to Maecenas in Macrob. II 4, 12 (cf. O. Jahn, Hermes II. p. 247 sq.) and in Sueton. vita Horat. Augustus in epistolis ad C. Caesarem, Quintil. I 6, 19. cf. ib. 7, 22.

4. Suet. 101: tribus voluminibus, uno mandata de funere suo complexus est, altero indicem rerum a se gestarum, quem vellet incidi in aeneis tabulis quae ante Mausoleum statuerentur, tertio breviarium totius imperii, quantum militum sub signis ubique esset, quantum pecuniae in aerario et fiscis et vectigaliorum residuis. Tac. A. I 11: proferri libellum recitarique iussit (Tiberius). opes publicae continebantur, quantum civium sociorumque in armis, quot classes, regna, provinciae, tributa aut vectigalia et necessitates ac largitiones. quae cuncta sua manu perscripserat Augustus addideratque consilium coercendi intra terminos imperii. Cf. Dio LXI 33. The Index was copied for temples erected to Augustus in the provinces: e. g. for the Augusteum at Apollonia (C. I. gr. 3971), a small fragment of which exists in Greek (Mommsen, res gestae D. Aug. p. XXIV) and for the temple at Ancyra in Galatia. The latter copy was almost completely discovered in the Latin original and in a Greek translation: the Monumentum Ancyranum, a further part of which was discovered by G. Perrot 1861. A complete edition with full explanations: Res gestae Divi Augusti, ex monumentis Ancyrano et Apolloniensi ed. Th. Mommsen, Berlin 1865. The parts

formerly known were published in Egger's Examen critique p. 421—456; ex reliquiis graecae interpretationis restituit J. Franz, commentario perpetuo instruxit A. W. Zumpt, Berlin 1845. 4.; in the appendix of Orelli's Tacitus I. p. 571—591. Augustus seems to have composed some parts of this index as early as 750 (Mommsen p. XLII and 37. W. Brambach, Rhein. Mus. XX p. 605); but the final revision and latest additions were made in the summer of 767: see Mommsen p. 3 sq.

5. Suet. Aug. 85: poetica summatim attigit. unus liber exstat, scriptus ab eo hexametris versibus, cuius et argumentum et titulus est Sicilia; exstat alter aeque modicus Epigrammatum (cf. Martial. XI 20), quae fere tempore balinei meditabatur. nam tragoediam magno impetu exorsus, non succedenti stilo, abolevit, quaerentibusque amicis (Macrob. II 4, 2 mentions especially L. Varius), quidnam Aiax ageret, respondit Aiacem suum in spongiam incubuisse. Suidas v. *Αὔγουστος Καῖσαρ* (I. p. 851 B.): *ἔγραψε περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου βίου καὶ τῶν πράξεων βιβλία ιγ'* (see note 3) *καὶ τραγῳδίαν Αἴαντός τε καὶ Ἀχιλλέως.* The latter may have met with the same fate as his Ajax.

6. C. Maecenas (e. g. Tac. A. XIV 53; ib. VI 11: Cilnium Maecenatem, equestris ordinis; cf. Macrob. II 4, 12: Cilniorum smaragde) of a noble Etruscan family, born id. April. (Hor. O. IV 11, 14—20) probably between 680 and 690. Octavianus appears to have employed him first a. 714 (Appian. b. c. V 53), and afterwards often trusted him with political missions, whenever Maecenas' talent for reconciliation could be turned to profit. His lack of real ambition (though he was vain enough) fitted him for positions of trust, such as he occupied at Rome after the battle of Actium, while in war he never played an important part: see Frandsen p. 24 sqq. 40 sqq. According to T. Gallus in Schol. Verg. Ge. I 2, Maecenas praefectus praetorio fuit; see Mommsen, Rhein. Mus. XVI p. 448. About a. 731 (see W. Teuffel in Ztsch. f. A. W. 1845 p. 608 sqq.) he married Terentia, a marriage which Augustus' want of tact made a constant source of annoyance to him. He died after a long illness a. 746 (Dio LV 7).

7. The best description of his character is given by Vellei. II 88, 2: C. Maecenas, equestri sed splendido genere natus, vir ubi res vigiliam exigeret sane exsomnis, providens atque agendi sciens, simul vero aliquid ex negotio remitti posset, otio ac mollitiis paene ultra feminam fluens; non minus Agrippa Caesari carus (and useful), sed minus honoratus; .. nec minora consequi poterat, sed non tam concupivit. He receives a one-sided treatment from Seneca who employs against him his Stoic philosophy, especially Epist. 114, 4: quomodo Maecenas vixerit notius est quam ut narrari nunc debeat, quomodo ambulaverit, quam delicatus fuerit, quam cupierit videri, quam vitia sua latere voluerit. quid ergo? non oratio eius aeque soluta est quam ipse discinctus? non tam insignita illius verba sunt quam cultus, quam comitatus, quam domus, quam uxor? magni vir ingenii fuerat (Epist. 92, 35 he even says: habuit ingenium et grande et virile, and 19, 9 ingeniosus vir) si . . non etiam in ora-

tione diffluerent. videbis itaque eloquentiam ebrii hominis, involutam et errantem et licentiae plenam. He subjoins (5) a specimen of Maecenas de cultu suo, and adds (6): non statim cum haec legeris hoc tibi occurret hunc esse qui solutis tunicis in urbe semper incesserit? . . hunc esse qui . . in omni publico coetu sic adparuerit ut pallio velaretur caput exclusis utrimque auribus . .? hunc esse cui . . comitatus hic fuerit in publico, spadones duo . .? hunc esse qui uxorem miliens duxit, cum unam habuerit? etc. Cf. Epist. 19, 9. 92, 35. 101, 10 sqq. 120, 19. Dial. I (de provid.), 3, 10 sqq. But this mollities (Sen. Ep. 114, 7 sq.) was no doubt calculated to give his personal position a very innocent appearance.

8. Maecenas in eo libro qui Prometheus inscribitur (Sen. Ep. 19, 9) in prose; Maecenas in dialogo II ap. Charis. I. p. 146 K. Maecenas in Octaviam (prose) ap. Priscian. X. p. 536 Htz. Serv. Aen. VIII 310: Maecenas in Symposio, ubi (cui) Vergilius et Horatius interfuerunt, cum ex persona Messalae de vino loqueretur ait (in prose). Sen. de benef. IV 36, 2 — Servius on Virgil Georg. II 42: constat Maecenatem . . plura composuisse carmina. A hexameter in Sen. Ep. 92, 35. Charis. I. p. 79 sq. K. (cf. Grammat. lat. V p. 575, 1), Diomed. I p. 366 P. = 369 K., perhaps also Grammat. lat. V p. 591 K. Sen. Epist. 101, 11 quotes glyconeans of Maecenas, and hendecasyllabics are quoted by Sueton. vita Hor., perhaps also by Isidor. Orig. XIX 32, 6. Galliambics in Diomed. III. p. 514 and Atil. Fortunat. p. 2677 P. Witticism of Augustus on Maecenas' style (calamistri, Tac. dial. 26) in Sueton. Aug. 86 and Macrob. II 4, 12. Strangely Dio LV 7: *πρῶτος σημεῖά τινα γραμμάτων πρὸς τάχος ἐξεῦρε καὶ αὐτὰ δι' Ἀκύλου ἀπελευθέρου συχνοὺς ἐξεδίδαξεν.* See rather above 178, 4. In the same way Servius (on Ge. II 42) erroneously concludes from Hor. Od. II 12, 9 sqq.: etiam Augusti Caesaris gesta descripsit.

9. In general see J. H. Meibom, Maecenas, sive de C. Cilnii Maecenatis vita, moribus et rebus gestis liber singularis, Lgd. Bat. 1653. 4. A. Lion, Maecenatiana, sive de C. C. M. vita et moribus scripsit atque operum fragmenta collegit, Götti. 1824. A. Haakh in Pauly's Enc. II. p. 355—357. P. S. Frandsen, C. Cilnius Maecenas, an historical disquisition on his life and activity. Altona 1843. 283 pp. Cf. W. Teuffel in the Annals of Contemporary History 1843, n. 23 sq. W. E. Weber, Q. Horatius Flaccus (Jena 1844) p, 143 sqq. H. J. Matthes in his Symbolae literariae V p. 1—36.

10. M. Vipsanius Agrippa, born 691, hence of the same age as Octavianus, whose friend he was from boyhood, praetor 714, Cos. 717, aedile 721, when his splendid care for the interests of Rome marked the contrast between Octavianus and M. Antony who was then revelling with Cleopatra, Censor and Cons. II a. 726, Cons. III a. 727. He was Octavianus' best general and admiral, and also successful as a diplomatist, especially in the East; he was faithful and trustworthy, but knew his importance well enough and would not bear anybody above

himself except Caesar's heir; in a. 733 he became Augustus' son-in-law, and died 741 = 13 B. Chr.

11. He possessed rhetorical training, and a. 711 accused C. Cassius as one of the assassins of Caesar (Plut. Brut. 27, cf. Vellei. II 69, 5) and even later appeared as a defender (Sen. Controv. II 12, 13. p. 155, 13 Bu.); see also Plin. N. H. XXXV 9, 26: exstat eius oratio magnifica et maximo civium digna de tabulis omnibus signisque publicandis. In literature he had a somewhat coarse (Plin. l. l.: M. Agrippa, vir rusticitati propior quam deliciis), but healthy taste (see above p. 388, n. 5) and in his subjects showed a practical tendency. Frontin. aquaed. 98: M. Agrippa . . descripsit quid aquarum publicis operibus, quid lacibus, quid privatis daretur. ib. 99: qui ex commentariis Agrippae aquas haberent.

12. Survey and Map of the Empire. The pretended Aethicus Ister Expos. in., in Gronovius' Mela: Iulius Caesar . . cum consulatus sui fasces erigeret ex Sc. censuit omnem orbem iam romani nominis admetiri per prudentissimos viros et omni philosophiae munere decoratos. ergo a Iulio Caesare et M. Antonio coss. orbis terrarum metiri coepit . . usque ad consulatum Augusti III et Crassi, annis XXI . . . a Zenodoxo omnis oriens dimensus est. . . a consulatu item Iulii Caesaris et M. Antonii usque in consulatum Augusti X., annis XXIX . . a Theodoto septentrionalis pars dimensa est. . . a consulatu similiter Iulii Caesaris usque in consulatum Saturnini et Cinnae a Polyclito meridiana pars dimensa est, annis XXXII, . . ac sic omnis orbis terrae intra annos XXXII a dimensoribus peragratus est et de omni eius continentia perlatum est ad senatum. In the cod. Vatic. 3864 this is abridged and at the same time supplemented: Iulio Caesare et M. Antonio coss. omnis orbis peragratus est per sapientissimos et electos viros IV, Nicodemo orientis, Didymo occidentalis, Theudoto septemtrionalis, Polyclito meridiani. Liber colon. p. 239 Lachm.: Balbi mensoris, qui temporibus Augusti omnium provinciarum et formas civitatium et mensuras compertas in commentariis contulit. Cf. F. Ritschl, the Survey of the Roman Empire under Augustus, the Chart of Agrippa and the Cosmography of Aethicus, Rhein. Mus. N. Ser. I (1842) p. 481—523, especially p. 486 sqq. Chr. Petersen, the Cosmography of the Emperor Augustus and the commentarii of Agrippa, Rhein. Mus. VIII p. 161—210. 377—403. IX p. 85—106. K. Müllenhoff, on the Chart and Chorography of the Emperor Augustus, Kiel 1856. 4., and A. v. Gutschmid, Rhein. Mus. XII p. 619 sqq. On Agrippa's part in this see especially Plin. N. H. III 2, 16 sq.: longitudinem universam eius (Baeticae) prodidit M. Agrippa 475 m. p., latitudinem 258. . . Agrippam quidem, in tanta viri diligentia praeterque in hoc opere cura, cum orbem terrarum urbi spectandum propositurus esset, errasse quis credat et cum eo divum Augustum? is namque complexam eam porticum ex destinatione et commentariis M. Agrippae a sorore eius inchoatam peregit. From this it would appear that Agrippa left only the sketch of a Chart and chorographic commentarii, but in his will ordered his sister (Pola) on the basis of both to get his great

Chart made for a public porch, an order subsequently carried out by Augustus. See also Plin. IV 12, 81: Agrippa totum eum tractum ab Histro ad oceanum . . in longitudinem, . . in latitudinem prodidit. ib. 91: Sarmatiae . . longitudo . ., latitudo . . a M. Agrippa tradita est. ego incertam in hac terrarum parte mensuram arbitror. Hence Martian. Cap. VI 632 (p. 212 Eyss.) and 634 (p. 213 E.).

13. Agrippa wrote also an autobiography. Philargyr. on Verg. Georg. II 162: Agrippa in secundo vitae suae dicit excogitasse se ut ex Lucrino lacu portum faceret. Cf. Plin. N. H. VII 45, 148: (Augusti) Philippensi proelio morbidi fuga et triduo in palude aegroti et, ut fatentur Agrippa et Maecenas, aqua subter cutem fusa turgidi latebra.

14. Besides the antiquated works of F. W. Sommer (1617. 4.), G. C. Gebauer (1777), Le Blond (1780) and Raphael Mecenate (de vita rebusque gestis M. Vips. Agr. commentarius, testimoniis scriptorum veterum concinnatus, Rome 1821): see especially P. S. Frandsen, M. Vipsanius Agrippa, an historical investigation on his life and activity, Altona 1836. 260 pp. D. v. Lakeren-Matthes, de Agr. in remp. rom. meritis, Amsterdam 1840. J. H. van Eck, quaestiones historicae de M. V. A., Leyden 1842. 59 pp. A. Preuner in Pauly's Enc. I 1. p. 599—609.

218. Next to these leading men, Asinius Pollio and Valerius Messala were in the Augustan period the most prominent on account of their past career and position among their contemporaries. C. Asinius Pollio (679—758) who in the Civil Wars exerted himself for Caesar and Antony (Cons. 714, his triumph ex Parthicis 715), but fell out with the latter without going over to Octavianus, then retreated from political life and devoted himself to literature and oratorical activity. At first he wrote tragedies, then a history of the Civil Wars after the first triumvirate, but this work was never finished. As an orator and writer he affected antique severity as opposed to Ciceronian smoothness, and when his sphere as an orator was cramped, he found a substitute in the public recitations. By keeping aloof from politics he managed to maintain both his position and the name of independence, but exercised a very severe criticism within the domain of literature. M. Valerius Messala also (a. 690—762) had been driven into the camp of Octavianus by his want of respect for Mark Antony, and subsequently served Octavianus with fidelity and sincerity, but without debasing himself. In his activity as an orator he was on a level with Pollio, but had something aristocratic and effeminate, which may account

for his not joining the current which now set in towards declamation. He then busied himself with antiquarian and grammatical investigations, in the first of which he showed the jealous pride of an aristocrat, in the latter he descended to the most minute details. In his younger days he shared the tendency of his time in admiring Greek literature, translated Greek and composed in Greek himself, both in poetry and in prose (his Memoirs).

1. C. Asinius Cn. f. Pollio, born 679 = 75, accused C. Cato a. 700, praetor 709. After Caesar's death he would gladly have joined the party of the Senate, if they had only shown more courage and prudence, or if they had been more fortunate or made advances to him. As it was, he decided after long hesitation in favour of M. Antony. In the division of places among the partisans of the triumvirs a. 711, Pollio was designated Consul and obtained that dignity a. 714 = 40 B. Chr. In the same year he fought against the Parthines who had been for Brutus; capture of Salonae and his triumph ex Parthineis a. d. VIII Kal. Nov. (Fasti cap. and Barb.). We do not know the causes of his estrangement from M. Antony, though there may have been plenty of reasons on either side, and the fact itself appears from the citation in Charis. I. p. 80, 2 K.: Asinius contra maledicta Antonii. On the other hand, he thought too well of himself to join Octavianus (Vellei. II 86, 3 sq.) or to submit to him; until his death he held aloof from him without open opposition and real submission. Hieron. ad Euseb. chron., a. Abr. 2020 = Ol. 195, 4 = a. Aug. 47 = 5 A. D. = 758 v. c.: Asinius Pollio orator et consularis, qui de Dalmatis triumpharerat, LXXX aetatis suae anno in villa Tusculana moritur. This is confirmed by Sen. Controv. IV. praef. 5 (p. 376 Bu.), according to which passage Pollio was alive A. D. 4, and Tac. dial. 17: Asinius paene ad extremum (Augusti principatum) duravit.

2. The poems of Pollio. Carmina Sophocleo digna cothurno, i. e. tragedies, either written or about to be written in the time of Virgil's Ecl. 8, 10 (a. 715), cf. ib. 3, 86 (Pollio et ipse facit nova carmina). Hor. S. I 10, 42 sq. (c. a. 718): Pollio regum facta canit pede ter percusso (in iambic trimeters). O. II 1, 9—12 (a. 724 or 725): paulum severae Musa tragoediae desit theatris, while A. P. was writing his history of the Civil Wars. That A. P. actually published tragedies appears from Tac. dial. 21: Asinius . . videtur mihi inter Menenios et Attios studuisse; Pacuvium certe et Attium non solum tragoediis sed etiam orationibus suis expressit: adeo durus et siccus est. That they were acted seems to appear from the expression theatris used by Horace: but we are without further information concerning them. Subsequent to his history A. P. does not appear to have reverted to tragedy. An error seems to be in Serv. Verg. Ecl. 8, 10: alii ideo hoc de Pollione dictum volunt quod et ipse utriusque

linguae tragoediarum scriptor fuit. A. P. wrote also erotic poetry (according to Pliny Ep. V 3, 5 — see above 26, 1 and comp. VII 4, 4); from this or perhaps from a collection of Erotica may be derived Charis. I. p. 100, 24 K.: Polio 'Veneris antistita Cupra' (Cuprias).

3. History of the Civil Wars from the first triumvirate (a. 694, Metello consule, Hor. O. II 1, 1 cf. Suid. v. *Πωλίων: περὶ τοῦ ἐμφυλίου τῆς Ῥώμης πολέμου ὃν ἐπολέμησαν Καῖσάρ τε καὶ Πομπήϊος*), in Latin (*ῥωμαικῶς*, Suidas v. *Ἀσίνιος*), and as it seems simply called Historiae (Sen. suas. 15, p. 33, 2: Pollio in Historiis suis. ib. 25, p. 37: in Historiis eius . . ne Historias eius legere concupiscatis; cf. Val. Max. VIII 13. ext. 4). It treated of the battle of Pharsalus (Suet. Caes. 30 H. Peter, on the sources of Plutarch, p. 124—127), of the war in Spain (Suet. Caes. 55), Cicero's death (Sen. suas. 24. p. 36 sq. Bu.) and perhaps also of the battle of Philippi (comp. Tac. A. IV 34: Asinii Pollionis scripta egregiam eorundem — Cassius and Brutus — memoriam tradunt). According to Horace O. II 1, 1—8. 17 sqq. he was elaborating them about the year 724 or 725, and at least three books were also published by him (Val. Max. VIII 13. ext. 4: Asinius Pollio, non minima pars romani stili, in tertio Historiarum suarum libro); but it is doubtful whether 17 were published (Suidas v. *Ἀσίνιος Πωλίων: Ῥωμαῖος, ἱστορίας ῥωμαικὰς συνέταξεν ἐν βιβλίοις ιζ'*), as this number may apply to a continuation of the work from the materials of the author by his freedman, A. P. of Tralles (W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. I 2 p. 1868 n. 25). The absence of quotations on the broils between Octavianus and M. Antony (it not being proved that the passage on Tiberius, Prisc. VIII 19 p. 386, 9 sq. Htz is from the Historiae) renders it probable that the work of A. P. did not embrace them and was not finished, perhaps because A. P. himself saw it to be periculosae plenum opus aleae (Hor. O. II 1, 6). Sen. suas. 25 says that the parts published were not rhetorical, and Ateius (above 207, 1) had advised him historiam componere aggresso, ut noto civilique et proprio sermone utatur (Suet. gramm. 10, p. 109, 2 sqq. R.).

4. On Pollio as orator, both judicial and political (Hor. O. II 1, 13 sq.), later as a declaimer, see the passages in H. Meyer, orat. rom.[2] p. 487—491 and F. Blass, on Greek eloquence (1865) p. 141—144. Sen. Epist. 100, 7: compositio Pollionis Asinii salebrosa et exsiliens et ubi minime exspectes relictura. denique omnia apud Ciceronem desinunt, apud Pollionem cadunt, exceptis paucissimis quae ad certum modum et ad unum exemplar adstricta sunt. Quintil. X 1, 113: multa in Asinio Pollione inventio, summa diligentia, adeo ut quibusdam etiam nimia videatur, et consilii et animi satis; a nitore et iucunditate Ciceronis ita longe abest ut videri possit saeculo prior. See the (exaggerated) account in Tac. dial. 21 (above 2), cf. 25 numerosior Asinius). But in his rhetorical displays he was floridior aliquanto (Sen. Contr. p. 376, 5 sq. Bu.) than in his judicial speeches. Instances of them are given by the elder Seneca, e. g. p. 185. 192. 223. 382 Bu.; a collection of the fragments of the judicial speeches in Meyer l. l. p. 491—501. Among

them the later ones are all defensive speeches, unless in Charis. I p. 97, 11 K. we should read with the excerpta Cauchiana Asinius in Valeriam. The accounts of his style and his opposition to Cicero (Quintil. XII 1, 2) would characterise A. P. as an adherent of the Atticists in the Ciceronian age, from whom he is, however, distinguished by Quintil. X 2, 7.

5. Other prose-works by Pollio. As a philosophical writer Pollio is mentiond by Sen. Ep. 100, 9. Asinius Pollio ad Caesarem I ap. Charis. I. p. 134, 3 K. Cf. n. 6. There are only three letters extant from A. P. to Cicero, ad fam. X 31—33. See above 214, 3. From the fact that Aristius Fuscus dedicated a grammatical treatise to A. P. (Eichenfeld, Anal. gramm. p. 452), and from Charis. I. p. 84, 5 sqq. (puer et in feminino sexu antiqui dicebant, ut . . in Nelei carmine, . . ubi tamen Varro . . a puera putat dictum, sed Aelius Stilo, magister eius, et Asinius contra), as well as Prisc. X. p. 888 P. = 513, 7 sq. Htz. (nanciscor etiam nactum facit, absque n, ut Probo et Capro et Pollioni et Plinio placet) and other circumstances M. Haupt, in the Berlin list of summer lectures 1855, p. 3—5, infers the existence of grammatical works by A. P. to which he attributes his literary and aesthetic opinions (see below n. 6), also Charis. I p. 97, 11 (see above 4), Asinius in Valerium, by which Haupt thinks that Catullus is meant. Against this see Th. Bergk (Philol. XXIX 329) and J. Steup (de Prob. p. 71) who assume the existence of a grammarian Pollio different from A. P.

6. Pollio as a critic. Sen. Controv. IV. praef. 3 (p. 376, 7 sqq. Bu.): illud strictum eius (of A. P.) et asperum et nimis iratum in censendo (so O. Jahn) iudicium adeo cessabat (in the declamations of A. P.) ut in multis illi venia opus esset quae ab ipso vix impetrabatur. Just as his judgment on Cicero (above 163, 1) was no doubt derived from the Historiae, the one on Caesar's commentaries (Suet. Caes. 56; see above 183, 1) appears to be derived from the same source; that on Porcius Latro (Sen. p. 144, 6 sqq. Bu.) is from a declamation; the censure of Cicero (Sen. suas. 15, p. 32 sq. Bu.) is from a speech (Sen. l. l.) and perhaps also the one on an expression of Labienus (Quintil. IX 3, 13, cf. ib. IV 1, 11). Besides this, see Sueton. gramm. 10, p. 108, 3 Rffsch.: Asinius Pollio in libro quo Sallustii scripta reprehendit (see above 204, 5). This 'liber' was possibly in the form of letters, cf. Gell. X 26, 1: Asinio Pollioni in quadam epistola quam ad Plancum scripsit . . dignum nota visum est quod (Sallustius) in primo Historiarum etc. Perhaps this 'liber' contained also his criticism on Cicero's style (Quintil. XII 1, 22) and his censure of the Paduan smack of Livy's diction (Quintil. VIII 1, 3).

7. On the foundation of a library through A. P. and his introduction of recitations see above p. 390 sq. — J. R. Thorbecke, disputatio historicocritica de C. A. P., Leyden 1820. Drumann, Hist. of Rome II p. 2—12. Clemen, C. A. P., Lemgo 1842. 4. F. Jacob, A. P., Lübeck

1852. 4. O. Hendecourt, diss. de vita, gestis et scriptis A. P., Löwen 1858. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Enc. I 2. p. 1859—1865. B. Luzzato, ricerche storiche su Cajo Asinio Pollione, Padua 1867.

8. M. Valerius M. f. Messala Corvinus. Hieronym. ad a. Abr. 1958 = Ol. 180, 2 = 58 b. Chr. = 696 v. c.: Messala Corvinus orator nascitur et T. Livius Patavinus scriptor historicus; and ad a. Abr. 2027 = 54 Aug. = 7 Archelai = 11 A. D. = 764 V. C.: Messala Corvinus ante biennium quam moreretur ita memoriam ac sensum amisit ut vix pauca verba coniungeret, et ad extremum . . inedia se confecit, anno aetatis LXXII (Freherianus: LXXVII). The date of his death (A. D. 11) is certainly wrong: as Ovid who was exiled in December A. D. 9 was still at Rome when Messala died (Ov. ex Ponto I 7, 27—30): whence it is evident that Messala died in that year. Supposing him to have been 72 years old, he must have been born a. V. C. 690 = 64 B. Chr., i. e. in the same year with Cicero's son (Cic. ad Att. I 2, 1) with whom (and Horace, born end of 689) Messala studied together at Athens (a. 709 sq.): Messala was appointed consul 1 Jan. 723, Cicero on the ides of September 724. C. Nipperdey, Rh. Mus. XIX 282—288. See also Borghesi, Oeuvres numism. I p. 408 sqq. The statement in Tac. dial. 17: Corvinus in medium usque Augusti principatum . . duravit, is no doubt erroneous: see Rh. Mus. XIX 288—292. Though not present at Rome when Caesar was assassinated, Messala was proscribed a. 711; his name was, however, removed from the list, but he still remained with Brutus and Cassius, in whose camp he held a prominent position (Vellei. II 71, 1: Messala, fulgentissimus iuvenis, proximus in illis castris Bruti Cassiique auctoritati). After the battle of Philippi (a. 712) he went over to Antony, but was soon disgusted with his revels (Plin. N. H. XXXIII 3, 14. Charis. I. p. 129, 7 K.: Messala contra Antonii litteras. ib. p. 104, 18: M. Messala de Antonii statuis) and made his peace with Octavianus (Appian. b. c. IV 38) who received him with open arms and (a. 718 sqq.) employed him in several affairs; a. 723 = 31 he was even appointed consul in the place of Antony. Messala henceforth remained faithful to Octavianus, without, however, betraying his former friends and principles (cf. Plut. Brut. 53). *Περὶ Ἄκτιον ναυαρχήσας* (App. b. civ. IV 38). His victory on the Atax over the Aquitanians on his birthday (Tib. I 7) and his triumph (ex Gallia, a. d. VII Kal. Oct.) 727 = 27 B. Chr. A. 729 = 25 Messala Corvinus primus praefectus urbis factus sexto die magistratu se abdicavit, incivilem potestatem esse contestans (Hieronym. chron. ad a. Abr. 1991, cf. Tac. A. VI 11. Rh. Mus. XIX. p. 285). Curator aquarum a. 743 = 11 B. Chr., Frontin. aq. 99 cf. 102. A. 752 he moved that Augustus should receive the title of pater patriae (Suet. Aug. 58). A spurious elogium on Messala is found in Orelli-Henzen 5346. See, on the whole, A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. VI 2 p. 2352 sq. note.

9. As early as 711 Cicero ad Brut. I 15, 1 writes of Messala: cave putes probitate, constantia, cura, studio reip. quidquam illi esse simile; ut eloquentia, qua mirabiliter excellit, vir in eo locum ad laudandum

habere videatur. quamquam in hac ipsa sapientia plus apparet: ita gravi iudicio multaque arte se exercuit in verissimo genere dicendi. tanta autem industria est tantumque evigilat in studio ut non maxima ingenio . . gratia habenda videatur. The expression verissimum genus dicendi shows that Messala had not joined the New Attic School, but the manner of Cicero. Cf. Tac. dial. 18: Cicerone mitior Corvinus et dulcior et in verbis magis elaboratus. Quintil. X 1, 113: Messala nitidus (cf. I 7, 35) et candidus et quodammodo praeferens in dicendo nobilitatem suam, viribus minor. Sen. controv. II 12, 8 (p. 152 Bu.): fuit Messala exactissimi ingenii quidem in omni studiorum parte, latini utique sermonis observator diligentissimus. In Sen. ludus de m. Claud. 10, 2 he is called disertissimus vir. Suet. Tib. 70: in oratione latina secutus est Corvinum Messalam, quem senem adolescens observarat. On Messala's introductions see Quintil. IV 1, 8 and Tac. dial. 20 in. His speech against Aufidia (defended by Ser. Sulpicius, † 711, see above 161, 3) was known to Quintilian (X 1, 22). Other information in Meyer. orat. fragm. [2] p. 510—513.

10. Quintil. X 5, 2: vertere graeca in latinum veteres nostri oratores optimum iudicabant. . . id Messalae placuit, multaeque sunt ab eo scriptae ad hunc modum orationes, adeo ut etiam cum illa Hyperidis pro Phryne difficillima Romanis subtilitate contenderet. He wrote bucolic poems in Greek (above 25, 2) and, as it seems, in the allegorical manner of Virgil's Bucolics; a (metrical) translation of them was contemplated by the author of Catal. Verg. 11 (cf. below 225, n. 5). On account of these and of other poems Pliny Ep. V 3, 5 (cf. above 26, 1) places him among the erotic poets. The existence of Memoirs by Messala (perhaps in Greek) concerning the battle of Philippi etc. may be inferred from Plut. Brut. 40. 42. 45., and also Appianus seems to have used them (cf. e. g. b. c. IV 38. 121). Sueton. Aug. 74: Valerius Messala tradit etc. Plin. N. H. XXXIII 3, 14: Messala orator prodidit etc. Ibid. XXXV 2, 8: extat Messalae oratoris indignatio, quae prohibuit inseri genti suae Laevinorum alienam imaginem. similis causa Messalae seni expressit volumina illa quae de familiis condidit. Cf. XXXIV 38: verba ipsa de ea re Messalae senis ponam: Serviliorum familia etc. In the list of authorities of b. XXXIII (and XXXIV) Pliny mentions also Messala, b. XXXV ex . . Messala oratore, Messala sene. — Quintil. I 7, 35: ideo minus Messala nitidus quia quosdam totos libellos non verbis modo singulis sed etiam litteris dedit? cf. ib. 23: Messala in libro de S littera. IX 4, 38: quae fuit causa et Servio . . subtrahendae S litterae (at the end of a word, when the next word began with a consonant), quod reprehendit Luranius (Veranius? Bergk), Messala defendit. Cf. ib. I 5, 15. Investigations of this kind were elaborated by Messala even in epistolary form; Suet. gramm. 4 (p. 103 Rff.): eosdem litteratores vocitatos Messala Corvinus in quadam epistola ostendit.

11. A poem in honour of Messala, Tib. I 7; a panegyric in the same collection IV 1. Elegia ad Messalam below 225, 5, n. 2. In ge-

neral see D. G. Moller, disputatio de M. Valerio Messala Corvino, Altorf 1689. 4. C. van Hall, M. Val. Mess. Corvinus, Amsterdam 1820. 2 vols. L. Wiese, de M. Val. Messalae Corvini vita et studiis doctrinae, Berlin 1829. 79 pp.

12. The treatise de progenie Augusti Caesaris which bears the name of Messala is a production of the middle ages; it was first edited by J. Bedrot 1532—1540., then in several editions of the scriptores hist. rom., of Eutropius etc., the last time by C. H. Tzschucke, Lips. 1793, and Rafaelle Mecenate, Rome 1820. H. Jordan, Hermes III 426—428.

II. Poets.

219. The earliest of the poets of the Augustan period is L. Varius Rufus (c. 680—740 V. C.), an admirer of Caesar, then of Octavianus, on both of whom he composed epic poems: but his celebrity was chiefly obtained by his tragedy of Thyestes (a. 725), and by his friendship with Virgil and Horace, especially by editing the former's Aeneid. Of about the same age with him and also a friend of Virgil's was Aemilius Macer of Verona († 738 V. C.), the author of didactic poems in the manner of Nicander, Ornithogonia, Theriaca and probably also on a subject of botany (de herbis).

1. That Varius was nearly of the same age with Helvius Cinna (above 210, 2) and certainly older than Virgil, appears from Verg. Ecl. IX 35: neque adhuc Vario videor nec dicere Cinna digna. An epic poem on Caesar, de morte, specimens of which (12 hexameters) are given by Macrob. VI 1, 39 sq. 2, 19 sq. Hence Hor. S. I 10, 51 sq.: forte epos acer ut nemo Varius ducit. An epic poem by Varius in praise of the deeds of Agrippa (and Octavianus) is meant by Hor. O. I 6, 1—4, and this hope was fulfilled according to Porphyrio on Hor. Ep. I 16, 25: versus Tene magis etc. . . sunt notissimo ex panegyrico Augusti; cf. Acro ib.: haec enim Varius de Augusto scripserat. As an epic poet he is mentioned together with Virgil by Hor. Ep. II 3, 55. Perhaps he also wrote elegies; Porph. on Hor. O. I 6, 1: fuit L. Varius et ipse carminis et tragoediarum (but only his Thyestes in known) et elegorum (or elegiarum) auctor, Vergilii contubernalis. As a tragic poet he is mentioned by Martial VIII 14, 7 sq. When Horace wrote Ep. II 1, 247 (c. a. 742), Varius was dead.

2. A scholion in a palimpsest at Paris of about saec. VIII (Rhein. Mus. I 107) reports, after the heading Incipit Thuestes Varii: Lucius Varius cognomento Rufus Thyesten tragoediam magna cura absolutam post actiacam victoriam Augusti ludis eius (a. 725, cf. Dio LI 19. 21) in scena edidit. pro qua fabula sestertium deciens accepit. See F. W. Schneidewin, Rhein. Mus. I (1842). p. 106—112. II. p. 638 sq. A

quotation from it in Quintilian III 8, 45. Two anapaestic fragments without mention of the play in Ribbeck, trag. lat. p. 195 sq. cf. p. 347. ed. II p. 229 sq. Quintil. X 1, 98: Varii Thyestes cuilibet graecarum comparari potest. Tac. dial. 12 extr.: nec ullus Asinii aut Messalae liber tam illustris est quam Medea Ovidii aut Varii Thyestes. Philargyr. on Verg. Ecl. 8, 10: Varium, cuius exstat Thyestes tragoedia, omnibus tragicis praeferenda. F. G. Welcker, on Greek Tragedies III (1841) p. 1426—1430.

3. His relations to Augustus (Hor. Ep. II 1, 245 sqq.), Maecenas (Martial. VIII 56, 21. XII 4, 1 sq.), Horace, whom Varius introduced to Maecenas, (Hor. S. I 6, 55; cf. 5, 40. 93. 9, 23. 10, 89. II 8, 21. 63) and Virgil. For his edition of the Aeneid see below 224, 2. A work on Virgil, Quintil. X 3, 8: Vergilium paucissimos die composuisse versus auctor est Varius. Cf. Gell. XVII 10, 2: amici familiaresque P. Vergilii in iis quae de ingenio moribusque eius memoriae tradiderunt.

4. The tragedy of Tereus ascribed by Heerkens to Varius is in reality by an Italian of the 16th century, Gregorius Corrarius, and was printed under the title of Progne, Venice 1558. 4. Weichert de L. Vario p. 118—120.

5. A. Weichert, de L. Varii et Cassii Parmensis vita et carminibus (Grimma 1836) p. 1—120. R. Unger, de Valgii Rufi poematis (Hal. 1848) p. 296—303, and L. L. Varii de morte eclogae reliquiae expl., Halle 1870. 28 pp. 4.

6. Jerome on Eus. Chron. a. Abr. 2001 = Ol. 191, 1 = 28 Aug. = 738 V. C.: Aemilius Macer Veronensis poeta in Asia moritur. Serv. Verg. Ecl. V in.: Mopsus (intellegitur) Aemilius Macer Veronensis poeta, amicus Vergilii. Ovid, Trist. IV 10, 43 sq.: saepe suas volucres legit mihi grandior aevo quaeque necet serpens, quae iuvet herba Macer. Quintil. X 1, 87: Macer et Lucretius legendi quidem, sed non ut phrasin . . faciant; elegantes in sua quisque materia, sed alter (Macer) humilis, alter difficilis. ib. 56: Nicandrum frustra secuti Macer atque Vergilius (or Valgius)? XII 11, 27: neque post Lucretium ac Macrum Vergilius. VI 3, 96: Ovidius ex tetrastichon Macri carmine librum in malos poetas composuit. Tibull. II 6 in. Manil. astr. II 43 sqq.

7. A hexameter from Macer Aemilius Ornithogonias secundo quoted by Diomed. I. p. 374, 21 K. cf. Non. Marc. p. 220, 18 (Licinius Macer in Hornithogonia). 518, 25 (Aemilius Macer in Ornithogoniae libro I). Isidor. Orig. XII 7, 19. Unger p. 2—6. Macer Theriacon (II?) ap. Charis. I. p. 81, 18 K. cf. Isidor. Orig. XII 4, 24. Unger p. 6—10. Other quotations of a more vague character ap. Serv. Aen. I 435. Schol. Bern. Georg. II 160. Charis. p. 65, 7. 107, 4. 133, 11. 14, also 72, 17. 100, 33; the last-named two passages seem to be from his work on botany (Unger p. 11—14). Pliny mentions Macer as one of his authorities on b. IX, X, XI, XVII, and it is therefore probable (Unger p. 16 sq.) that also in b. XIX, XXI sq. XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXII where the list of authorities mentions Licinius Macer in reference to

a similar subject, we have the same confusion of names as in Non. p. 220, 18 and Diomed. p. 369, 15 K.

8. Broukhusius on Tibullus II 6. p. 274 sq. Maffei, Verona illustr. III 2. p. 41 sqq. R. Unger, de Aemilio Macro Nicandri imitatore, Friedland 1845. 18 pp. 4.

9. Erroneously the name of Aemilius Macer is given to the composition (in hexameters) of a certain physician Odo in the Carlovingian period de viribus herbarum; see Unger l. l. p. 10 sq.

220. P. Vergilius Maro was born at Andes near Mantua on Oct. 15, 684 = 70 B. Chr., in modest circumstances, but received a careful education. When, a. 713 and 714 V. C., his paternal estate had repeatedly been granted to veteran soldiers of Octavianus, the intercession of influential friends of his effected either restitution or indemnification. After that time, Virgil lived partly at Rome, partly in Campania (at Naples), variously impeded by his weak health, but gradually in the possession of sufficient means. After the completion and publication of his Bucolica (713—715) and Georgica (717—724), and when the Aeneid had already far advanced (he began it 725), Virgil wished to go to Athens and Asia for the further elaboration of his work, but at Athens was persuaded by Augustus to return, soon afterwards fell ill and died at Brundisium, Sept. 22, 735 = 19 B. Chr., aged 51 years.

1. Sources. a) Vita Vergilii de commentario Valeri Probi sublata, in H. Keil, M. Valerii Probi comm. (Halle 1848) p. 1 sq. and in Reifferscheid's Suetonius p. 52—54 cf. p. 398 sq. O. Jahn's Persius p. CXLI sqq. This is a carelessly made abstract, but keeps free from fabulous fictions; Ribbeck in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 1863, p. 351 sqq.

b) Donatus' vita Vergilii ap. Reifferscheid l. l. p. 54—69, and H. Hagen in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. Suppl. IV. p. 734—745; from a Paris ms. edited by E. Wölfflin, Philologus XXIV. p. 153—155. It is prefixed to Donatus' commentary on Virgil and mostly derived from Suetonius de viris illustribus, who himself owed most to Asconius who was in his his turn indebted to the works of L. Varius (above 219, 3) and C. Melissus (n. 4); it contains much valuable information, but is interpolated with additions from the commentary of Servius and especially by several nonsensical fictions of the middle ages which in the later mss. are added to the original text. Cf. Reifferscheid l. l. p. 399—403. Hagen p. 676—689.

c) Jerome on Euseb. Chron. ad a. Abr. 1948. 1959. 1964. 1999 = Ol. 177, 4. 180, 3. 181, 4. 190, 3. Also from Suetonius.

d) The vita bearing the name of Servius (prefixed to his commentary on the Aeneid), but which superseded the genuine life mentioned by Servius in his introduction to the Bucolics (II p. 97): see Reifferscheid p. 399.

Besides these, we possess a vita in hexameters (not quite complete) by Phocas, grammaticus urbis Romae, almost entirely taken from Donatus: see Reifferscheid p. 68—72 and p. 403 sq. Cf. W. Fröhner, Philologus XVIII. p. 356. Also vitae of less value in some mss., e. g. two Bernese mss., one Monacensis and a Reginensis; see Reifferscheid p. 52 sq. Hagen l. l. p. 745.

2. Name. The inscriptions of the Republic and the first centuries of the Christian era are in favour of Vergilius, not Virgilius; so also the older mss., e. g. the Medicean, and the Greeks also generally write *Βεργίλιος* or *Οὐεργίλιος*. The earliest dated instance of the spelling Virg. is saec. V (see below on Claudian). In the middle ages, about saec. IX, the spelling Virg. began to be general, caused by fictitious derivations of the name (from virgo or virga, which words formerly were vergo and verga), and in the 14th and 15th centuries this became quite victorious. But even then Angelus Politianus proved it to be an error. It has been defended by F. Schultz, orthographicarum quaestionum decas (Paderborn 1855) p. 42—44. Against him see E. Hübner, in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 77, p. 360 sq. H. Hagen, ibid. 95, p. 608. Th. Creizenach, ibid. 97, p. 294—296. F. Ritschl, Opusc. phil. II p. 779 sqq. See also Th. Bergk, Philol. XXVIII p. 441 sq. note. J. Pohl, "Programm" of Linz on the Rhine, 1871, p. 14—16.

3. The evidence on the life of Virgil is collected by W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. VI 2 p. 2644—2648, and by Ribbeck in his edition of the text (Bibl. Teubner. Lips. 1867) p. VIII—XXXVI. Virgil's mother was called Magia Polla, his father Maro. The latter was mercennarius or figulus and by his exertions gradually made a small fortune. The poet received his instruction at Cremona, after 696. After the assumption of the toga virilis (15 Oct. 699 = 55 B. Chr.) he went to Milan, 701 = 53 to Rome, where Verg. studuit apud Epidium (above 207, 3) ovatorem cum Caesare Augusto (vita Bernen.), though he pleaded only once. He was all the more zealous about philosophy, in which he and (Alfenus) Varus (above 205, 3) attended the Epicurean Siro (*Σείρων*, M. Haupt, Hermes I p. 40 sq.), and also studied mathematics and natural philosophy, also medicine. It is unknown when he returned to his native country. A. 713 the divisions of agri were extended from Cremona to the neighbouring territory of Mantua by the limitator Octavius Musa, and Virgil's paternal estate was assigned to a centurio called Arrius. Asinius Pollio and Cornelius Gallus interceded with Octavianus. At the end of the Perusine war, Octavianus replaced Pollio in Gallia transpadana by Alfenus Varus, a man devoted to him, who indeed promised to protect Virgil, but did not prevent the primipilaris Milienus Toro from possessing himself of his paternal estate, on which

occasion Virgil was nearly killed by a certain Clodius. Virgil and his father then fled to an estate formerly belonging to Siro (Cat. 10). Cornelius (Gallus) and (Aemilius?) Macer advised him to go to Rome, where the poet who had meanwhile become known through his Bucolics, was indemnified through Maecenas' intercession, perhaps in Campania (estate near Nola, Gell. VI (VII) 20, 1). At the end of 715, Virgil was already so familiar with Maecenas that he could introduce Horace into his circle. A. 717 both met on the iter Brundisinum, Hor. S. I 5, 40 sqq. The rest of Virgil's life is not remarkable for any further events. Dum Megara . . ferventissimo sole cognoscit languorem nactus est eumque non intermissa navigatione (from Greece to Italy) auxit ita ut aegrior aliquanto Brundisium appelleret, ubi diebus paucis obiit, XI Kal. Oct. Gn. Sentio Q. Lucretio coss. Ossa eius Neapolim translata sunt. Donatus' vita 35 (51). A life of 52 years is assigned to him Anthol. lat. 560. 566 R.

4. Personal appearance. Corpore et statura fuit grandi, aquilo colore, facie rusticana, varia valetudine. nam plerumque a stomacho et a faucibus ac dolore capitis laborabat, sanguinem etiam saepe reiecit. Donatus' vita 8 (19). It is, therefore, very probable that Horace in writing S. I 3, 29 sqq. had Virgil's outward appearance in his mind. We do not possess any trustworthy portraits of the poet. Donatus' vita 16 (27): in sermone tardissimum ac paene indocto similem eum fuisse Melissus tradidit. ib. 28 (43) sq. pronuntiabat autem (his compositions) cum suavitate tum lenociniis miris.

5. Personal connexions. Donatus' vita 13 (24): possedit prope centiens sestertium ex liberalitatibus amicorum (Hor. Ep. II 1, 246 sq. with Schol. Martial. VIII 56, 5 sqq. Serv. Ae. VI 862) habuitque domum Romae Esquiliis iuxta hortos Maecenatianos, quamquam secessu (Tac. dial. 13) Campaniae Siciliaeque plurimum uteretur. As Virgil lived very moderately, he might easily leave a considerable fortune. Heredes fecit ex dimidia parte Valerium Proculum fratrem alio patre, ex quarta Augustum, ex duodecima Maecenatem, ex reliqua (each $^1/_{12}$) L. Varium et Plotium Tuccam, Donatus 37 (56). Virgil had never been married.

221. Virgil was a childlike, innocent and amiable character, tender, sincere, and peaceful, a good son and faithful friend, honest in his mind and full of devotion both to persons and ideal interests, but not competent to grapple with the tasks and difficulties of practical life. The enemies he had in spite of these amiable qualities were not personal adversaries, but opponents to his political and literary position. Something similar to his personal character may be traced in his works. He is most successful in such subjects as admit of a genial treatment, for instance inanimate nature, his native

country, family-ties, or love. But he was too pliable and not of a genius great enough to persist in the field which suited his talent best and in which he might have gained lasting glory. He allowed himself to be led on to subjects for which he had no original talent. He collected his materials with the industry of a scholar and polished his diction with the persistence of an artist: yet the most conscientious labour could not make up for his want of creative and inventive talent, of native freshness and vividness. But this faithful labour gained for him that correctness and elegance in diction, style and metre, which made Virgil the standard of classicality in Roman poetry for a long time.

1. See the detailed account of the above characteristic by W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. VI 2 p. 2648—2651.

2. His character as a man. Horace (S. I 6, 54) calls Virgil optimus and (ib. 5, 40 sq.) anima candida; comp. S. I 3, 32 sq.: bonus ut melior vir etc. The ideal of a poet in Hor. Ep. II 1, 119 sqq. is evidently drawn after Virgil. See Donatus' vita 11 (22): et ore et animo tam probum constat ut Neapoli *Παρθενίας* vulgo appellatus sit ac si quando Romae, quo rarissime commeabat, viseretur in publico sectantes demonstrantesque se subterfugeret in proximum tectum. The scandal recorded by Donatus 9 sq. (20 sq.) on his love-affair with his favourite slave Alexander (= Alexis Ecl. II) and with Cebes, as well as with Plotia Hieria, an amica (see Hagen in Ribbeck's Prolegg. p. VI—VIII, who might also have quoted the Greek name as evidence) of L. Varius, arose with people who judged by themselves that which they could not understand in Virgil's character. Ib. 12 (23): bona cuiusdam exulantis offerente Augusto non sustinuit accipere.

3. Donat. 43 (61): obtrectatores Vergilio numquam defuerunt. As such he mentions Numitorius in his Antibucolica (see 222, n. 1), the Aeneidomastix of Carvilius Pictor, Herennius, who tantum vitia eius, Perellius Faustus, who furta (eius) contraxit. sunt et Q. Octavi Aviti *Ὁμοιοτήτων* octo volumina quos et unde versus transtulerit continent, ib. 43—45 (61—63). To these we should add Bavius and Maevius (see below), Anser a partisan of Antony, Cornificius (see above 206, 2), Cimber (Quintil. VIII 3, 27 sq.) and others. Echoes of these hostile criticisms in Macrob. Sat. I 24, 6 sq. III 10—12 and especially V 3—16 on supposed *furta* by Virgil. On the other hand, Asconius Pedianus wrote a liber contra obtrectatores Vergilii, Donatus 46 (64). Cf. Ribbeck's Prolegomena p. 96—113.

4. Hor. S. I 10, 45: molle atque facetum Vergilio annuerunt . . Camenae. Descriptions of inanimate nature occur in the Eclogues and Georgics, also Ae. V 213 sqq. IX 435 sqq. XI 68 sqq.; of a semi-idyllic character is also Ae. X 803 sqq. XI 456 sqq. cf. XII 473 sqq. He de-

scribes some plants in an excellent manner, E. Meyer, History of Botany I p. 374 sq. His patriotic warmth, Ge. II 136 sqq. Ae. VI 809 sqq. 842 sqq. He sympathizes with family happiness and the grief of a mother, Ge. II 523. Ae. VI 680 sqq. VIII 408 sqq. IX 283 sqq. 475 sqq., comp. also the sentimental passage on Marcellus at the end of Ae. VI. The whole fourth book of the Aeneid attests Virgil's sense of love, and this may be pronounced the most successful part of the whole. There is almost no trace of sarcasm in Virgil, see W. Hertzberg on Ae. XII 321. All his characters bear the stamp of mild humanity, free from harshness and ruggedness, but also devoid of energy.

5. Quintil. X 3, 8: Vergilium paucissimos die composuisse versus auctor est Varius (above 219, 3); cf. ib. 1, 86. Gell. XVII 10, 2 sq. Donat. vita 22 sq. (33 sq.) cf. 34 (49). To the Georgics Virgil devoted at least 7 years, and on the Aeneid he had already bestowed at least 10 and thought of devoting to it another triennium continuum (Donatus 35 = 51), after which time he wished to leave off writing and to devote himself to a contemplative life (ut reliqua vita tantum philosophiae vacaret, Donat. l. l.). Writing poetry was to him a labour, the end of which he longed to see. The unpractical scholar often betrays himself in Virgil's poems, e. g. Ge. I 281 sq. III 26 sqq. IV 408. Ph. Wagner ap. Heyne IV, p. 590—595. W. Hertzberg on Aen. VIII 660. 708. 726. As for his want of originality see our observations on each of his poems and the collections by F. Ursini, Virgilius collatione graecorum scriptorum illustratus, Antv. 1568, Leov. 1747. F. G. Eichhoff, Études grecques sur Virgile, ou Recueil de tous les passages des poètes grecs imités dans les Buc., les Géorg. et l'Énéide, Paris 1825. 3 vols. Also W. Ribbeck in his brother's edition.

6. In his political views, Virgil was a thorough Augustan. It is true, he fondly glances back at Rome's great past (Vergilius, amantissimus vetustatis, Quintil. I 7, 18), but in his own time he rejoices above all at the regained peace and omits no opportunity to praise the author of it in every way. Yet he has been spared the charge of servility which has been brought against Horace with so much noise and much less cause — but perhaps it was thought pardonable that Virgil "should honour the lords of the Earth with filial piety and with the respect which a grand political activity is sure to command of the mind of that poet who is only a poet." (C. Peter, Hist. of Rome III p. 109.) Compared with Antony, Virgil considers the cause of Octavianus as the national interest (Ae. VIII 685 sqq.), like Horace and Propertius. A philosophical theory of life is nowhere indicated, here also all is resolved into tender-heartedness. See, however, Aldenhoven, on Virgil's fatalism, Ratzeburg 1850. 4. R. Dietsch, theologumenon Vergilianorum particula, Grimma 1853. 4.

7. Quintil. X 1, 86: curae et diligentiae vel ideo in hoc (Verg.) plus (quam in Homero) est quod ei fuit magis laborandum, et quantum eminentibus vincimur fortasse aequalitate pensamus. But this very

'aequalitas', if not interrupted by anything, finally becomes monotonous. — C. G. Jacob, de epithetorum nonnullorum apud Verg. vi atque natura, Cologne 1829. 4. Th. Eppelin, on Virgil's comparisons, Lahr 1862. Spitta, Quaestiones Vergilianae, Götti. 1867, 4. (on the use of the plural to denote one thing or idea). On Virgil's use of hypallage, metonymia and hendiadys see W. Hertzberg's transl. of the Aeneid (Stuttg. 1859) p. XIV—XVIII.

222. Virgil's extant poems are as follows:

1) Bucolica, ten eclogues, written 713—715, imitations (and partly translations) of Theocritus, but with an artificial admixture of persons and events of contemporaneous history. The symmetrical composition of these poems is just as little doubtful as a uniform strophic arrangement cannot he proved.

1. Donatus' vita 19 (30): cum res romanas incohasset offensus materia ad Bucolica transiit, maxime ut Asinium Pollionem Alfenumque Varum et Cornelium Gallum celebraret, quia in distributione agrorum . . indemnem se praestitissent. 25 (40): Bucolica triennio . . perfecit. (Cf. Servius' vita Verg.: tunc ei proposuit Pollio ut carmen bucolicum scriberet, quod eum constat triennio scripsisse et emendasse.) 26 (41): Bucolica eo successu edidit ut in scena quoque per cantores crebro pronuntiarentur (cf. Tac. dial. 13. Serv. Ecl. VI 11). 43 (61): prolatis Bucolicis Numitorius quidam rescripsit Antibucolica, duas modo eclogas, sed insulsissime, παρῳδήσας. Of the various poems, X is confessedly the last-composed; also I and IX, IV and VIII, and VI contain hints for fixing their dates of composition; of V it may at least be stated that it was written after II and III, in both of which and in the seventh eclogue, the whole kind is least alloyed with historical allusions, for which reason they are perhaps the earliest pieces of the whole collection. See Ribbeck Prolegg. p. 1—10. C. Schaper in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 89 p. 633—657. 769—794, and against him Ribbeck l. l. p. 10—13. The Eclogues seem to have been published separately at first and had also separate headings (Ecl. VI 12). From Georg. IV 566 (cf. Ovid Amor. I 15, 25) it is evident that in publishing the whole collection Virgil assigned the first place to Ecl. I, and perhaps the whole arrangement may be due to him.

2. With regard to Theocritus, these Eclogues show in several places a proceeding very much like the 'Contamination' of the poets of Palliatae, (above 16, 8): e. g. ecl. III is made after Theocr. IV and V, Ecl. VIII from Theocr. II and III. A comparison with the Greek poet is rarely in favour of the Roman imitator; and in many places it is evident how Theocritus is spoilt: comp. e. g. VIII 43 sqq. with Theocr. III 15 sqq. To add foreign traits of contemporaneous history cannot be considered an improvement. The characters have not gained in life by Tityrus and Menalcas properly denoting Virgil himself, Daphnis (Ecl. V) Caesar, or that Ecl. III 84 sqq. we jump from Amyn-

tas to Pollio. "In some parts nothing has remained of the original Bucolic character, e. g. ecl. IV, in which the golden age supposed to begin with Pollio and the son born to him is described in an exaggerated manner, which is not very praiseworthy in spite of isolated pleasing passages." C. Peter, Hist. of Rome III p. 105. — Gell. IX 9, 4 sqq. G. A. Gebauer, de poetarum graecorum bucolicorum, imprimis Theocriti, carminibus in Eclogis a Vergilio expressis libri duo. Vol. I (librum I partemque posterioris continens), Lips. 1861. 256 pp. 8. (formerly Part. I. 1856); and Quatenus Vergilius in epithetis imitatus sit Theocritum, Lips. 1863. 4. (Program of Zwickau.) Of older works: see J. G. Meusel, de Theocr. et Virg. poetis bucolicis, Götti. 1766. 4. J. C. Jahn, compar. Id. XI Theocriti cum Ecl. II Virgilii, Culmbach 1781. 4.

3. The fashionable theory of so-called strophic composition was first applied to the eclogues by Ribbeck in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 75 p. 65—79 and subsequently in his editions. Cf. R. Peiper ibid. 91 p. 344—355. 95 p. 456—460. 97 p. 167 sq., and the sober judgment of Ph. Wagner, Lect. Vergil. (1859) p. 92. To those who really enjoy these poems more if they have them furnished with $\Lambda\alpha\beta$ α' β', aaaa, a′a′a′a′ etc., this pleasure shall not be begrudged, though we cannot boast this of ourselves and are convinced that the whole hypothesis cannot be admitted by unprejudiced criticism. Besides this, the hypothesis necessitates the ejection of a number of lines which otherwise are opposed to it and the assumption of gaps in places where otherwise no one would desire anything, e. g. VIII 58. X 47. That which is a matter of course in the amoebaean songs (e. g. III 60 sqq. VII 21 sqq.) should not be extended to the complete poems, if only to mark the distinction.

4. Virgil's rustic poems (text, metrical transl. and explanation) by J. H. Voss in 4 vols. (I and II containing the eclogues, III and IV the Georgics) Altona 1797. 1830. F. W. Genthe, Virgil's Eclogues, metrically translated, with an introduction concerning Virgil's life (p. 3—32), poetical influence (35—44) and an essay on Virgil as a magician (47—85), to which is added an Essay on Eclogue (89—134), Magdeburg 1830. Leipzig 1855.

5. The various readings of the Weissenau ms. of Virgil's Bucolics, Program of Feldkirchen 1861. P. Hofman-Peerlkamp, ad Virgilium (Ecl. and Georg.), Mnemosyne X. p. 1—49. 113—162. 229—308. 367—387. Th. Ladewig, a criticism on Peerlkamp's observations on the Bucolics, Neustrelitz 1864. 26 pp. 4.

6. Freymüller, on the Messianic (!) prophecy in Virgil's fourth Eclogue, Progr. of Metten 1852. 29 pp. 4. L. Giesebrecht, Damaris II (1861) p. 197 sqq. For the eighth eclogue see E. v. Leutsch, Philol. XXII p. 214—220, and Peiper in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 1864, p. 456—460. G. Gevers, the tenth eclogue of Virgil represented as a parody (Verden 1864), on which see Ph. Wagner, in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 91 p. 773—776. G. Bippart, Contributions to the explanation and criticism of Virgil

(Ecl. I and II), Prague 1868. 4. (Transactions of the Imperial Society of Letters).

223. 2) Georgica, in four books, written 717—724. The first book treats of agriculture, the second of the cultivation of trees, the third of domestic animals, and the fourth of bees. It is a didactic poem, caused by and dedicated to Maecenas, but on a subject suited to the personal inclinations and views of the poet. It is treated with evident warmth and love, and idealized as much as his nature permitted, so that even the didactic parts are not essentially different in tone from those which are more poetical. In fact, the masterly diction of the Georgics jusifies us in considering this poem the most perfect production of Roman art-poetry.

1. Donatus' vita 20 (31): deinde (after his Buc.) edidit Georgica in honorem Maecenatis. 25 (40): Georgica septem . . perfecit annis. (Cf. Serv. vita Verg.: item proposuit Maecenas Georgica, quae scripsit emendavitque septem annis.) 27 (42): Georgica reverso post actiacam victoriam Augusto atque Atellae reficiendarum faucium causa commoranti per continuum quadriduum legit, suscipiente Maecenate legendi vicem quotiens interpellaretur ipse vocis offensione. We see that the work was quite ready about the middle of a. 725; it was fit for publication and may have been so for several months already. That the publication was then not delayed any longer, appears probable on account of the beginning of the elaboration of the Aeneid, previous to which Virgil no doubt finished his Georgics, just as he did with his Bucolics on forming the design of writing the Georgics. A second edition by Virgil himself may be inferred from Serv. Ecl. X 1: fuit autem (Cornelius Gallus, see below 227) amicus Vergilii, adeo ut quartus Georgicorum (liber) a medio usque ad finem eius laudes teneret, quas postea (after Gallus' disgrace and death, a. 727) iubente Augusto in Aristaei fabulam commutavit. See on Georg. IV 1: sciendum . . ultimam partem huius libri esse mutatam. nam laudes Galli habuit locus ille qui nunc Aristaei et Orphei continet fabulam, quae inserta est postquam irato Augusto Gallus occisus est. A proposal of this kind would never have been made to Horace, and much less would he have acted on it. But Virgil yielded to it, and a second authentic edition was hence published about 728, this re-issue being of course intended for publicity. But it is in itself probable that the poet introduced also other changes, and some traces seem to point to this quite positively (Ribbeck Prolegg. 23. 24. 30), though they cannot have been very thorough, as even in the present shape of the work no allusion leads us lower down than 717 or higher up than 724 or 725 (ib. p. 14—22). A third edition may be inferred from Donatus' vita 40 (53): Vario ac simul Tuccae scripta sua sub ea condicione legavit ne quid ederent quod

non a se editum esset, as this implies the power of re-publishing the Bucolics and Georgics. It may be granted that in a third edition by another hand and from two different authentic editions some errors might arise; but it is preposterous to speak of the unfinished state of the Georgics, as both beginning and end show that the poet, for his part, completed the work. The criticism in Ribbeck's Prolegg. p. 31—48 touches only insignificant details, or if anything, proves that the poem might perhaps have been made more perfect than it actually is.

2. In this subject-matter Virgil availed himself of his personal experience in his youth. But his whole bent of mind would also induce him to consult other works, especially as both Greek and Roman literature abounded in works on agriculture (see above 44). Serv. Georg. I 43: sane sciendum Xenophontem scripsisse unum librum Oeconomicon, cuius pars ultima agriculturam continet. de qua parte multa ad hoc opus Vergilius transtulit, sicut etiam de Georgicis Magonis Afri (above 44, 1), Catonis (above 111), Varronis (above 156), Ciceronis quoque libro tertio Oeconomicorum (above 173, 18), qui agriculturam continet. Macrob. V 2, 4: vulgo nota sunt quod (Vergilius) Theocritum sibi fecerit pastoralis operis auctorem, ruralis Hesiodum et quod in ipsis Georgicis tempestatis serenitatisque signa de Arati Phaenomenis traxerit. Gell. IX 9, 3: scite et considerate Vergilius, cum aut Homeri aut Hesiodi aut Apollonii aut Parthenii (cf. ib. XIII 27, 1 sq.) aut Callimachi aut Theocriti aut quorundam aliorum locos effingeret, partem reliquit, alia expressit. Prob. comm. in Georg. p. 42, 13 sqq. K.: hanc universam disputationem (Georg. I 233 sqq.) certum est Vergilium transtulisse ab Eratosthene, cuius liber est hexametris versibus scriptus, qui Hermes incribitur. Plin. N. H. XVIII 75: Vergilius etiam in numeros lunae digerenda quaedam putavit, Democriti secutus ostentationem. But the constant use of one principal author cannot be proved. — Suidas v. *Ἀρριανός* states that a certain Arrianus wrote *μετάφρασιν τῶν Γεωργικῶν τοῦ Βεργιλλίου ἐπικῶς*. Columella (III 1, 1. VII 1, 3. X praef. 3. and v. 433 sqq.) is a warm admirer of the Georgics.

3. Edition by G. Wakefield, Cantabrig. 1788. Latin and German by J. C. Manso (Jena 1783) and J. H. Voss.

4. On the Georgics see in Heyne-Wagner's Edition I. p. 265—278. E. Tegner, de digressionibus in Georg. Verg., Lund 1799. De Verg. Georg. by E. L. Posselt (Carlsruhe 1786), A. G. Rein (Gera 1829. 4.). Bruner, de carm. didascal. (Helsingsf. 1840) p. 41—50. Jos. Schiestl, Virg. Georg. tantum abest ut sint poema omnibus numeris absolutum ut potius sint poema verae genuinaeque poesi omnino repugnans, Amberg 1830. 4. Jahn, Praef. p. XXXI—XXXVI. XL. Genthe l. l. p. 17—23. Titler, on the time of the publication of the Georgics, Brieg 1857. 21 pp. 4. Unterberger, on Virgil's Georgics, a literary Essay, Brixen 1863. 4.

5. Hanow, schedae criticae ad Verg. Georgica, Lissa 1863. 4. Th. Mommsen, on the Scholia on Virgil's Georgics, Rhein. Mus. XVI. p

442—453 cf. XVII. p. 143 sq. G. Thilo, Servii in Verg. Georg. I 1—100 commentarius, Halle 1866. 4.

224. 3) Aeneis, in twelve books, commenced c. 725, but not completed when the poet died a. 735, and published by L. Varius and Tucca contrary to his express desire. The Aeneid turns on the fate of Aeneas, the founder of a second Ilium and indirectly of Rome, and the ancestor of the Julian family. In writing this poem, Virgil partly availed himself of the example of Greek models, and partly he relied on his extensive studies on Italian legends, history and localities, and intentionally blended Greek and Italian peculiarities, to the detriment of native truth. In describing psychic events, the poet is fine and penetrating: yet in general, the events are but superficially explained as to their inner motives; the relation itself, except in the second and fourth books, is without real life, and its hero is 'rather soft.' The style is somewhat monotonously pathetic and not sufficiently natural. But Roman and Romance ears have always been charmed with this aristocratic elegance, and we feel at least the charm of his sonorous and beautiful lines.

1. From the promise Georg. III 46 sq. (mox tamen ardentis accingor dicere pugnas Caesaris etc.) we should rather infer an epic poem in honour of Octavianus, but with the Emperor's approbation (or according to Servius at his desire) the subject was extended. A. 728 Propertius was already acquainted with this extension of the design: see III 32 (II 34), 61—66. Cf. Donat. 30 (45). Ib. 25 (40): Aeneida XI perfecit (relatively speaking) annis. 23 (34): Aeneida prosa prius oratione firmatam digestamque in XII libros particulatim componere instituit, prout liberet quidque, et nihil in ordinem accipiens. (24 = 35.) ac ne quid impetum moraretur quaedam imperfecta transmisit, alia levissimis verbis veluti fulsit, quos per iocum pro tibicinibus interponi aiebat ad sustinendum opus, donec solidae columnae advenirent. Hence we learn that Virgil undertook the poetical elaboration of his prose-sketch in various places, just as his inclination prompted him, without minding the order of his design. ib. 30 (45): Aeneidos vixdum coeptae tanta exstitit fama ut Sex. Propertius non dubitaverit sic praedicare (see above), (31 = 46) Augustus vero — nam forte expeditione Cantabrica (a. 729) aberat — supplicibus atque etiam minacibus per iocum litteris efflagitaret ut "sibi de Aeneide vel prima carminis ὑπογραφὴ vel quodlibet κῶλον mitteretur". cui tamen multo post perfectaque demum materia (which does not include diction and style of the whole) tres omnino libros recitavit, secundum, quartum et sextum. An allusion to Aen. VI 287 sq. occurs in Horace (O. II 17, 17 sq., perhaps in the year 727), who may therefore be supposed to have known this part beforehand.

2. Donatus' vita 37 (56): . . L. Varium et Plotium Tuccam, qui eius Aeneida post obitum iussu Caesaris emendaverunt. 39 (52): egerat (Vergilius) cum Vario, prius quam Italia decederet, ut si quid ipsi accidisset Aeneida combureret; at is ita facturum se pernegarat; igitur in extrema valitudine assidue scrinia desideravit, crematurus ipse; verum nemine offerente nihil quidem nominatim de ea cavit. (40 = 53.) ceterum eidem Vario ac simul Tuccae scripta sua sub ea condicione legavit ne quid ederent quod non a se editum esset. (41 = 59.) edidit autem auctore Augusto Varius, sed summatim emendata, ut qui versus etiam imperfectos sicut erant reliquerit. Jerome on Euseb. chron. a. Abr. 2000 = Aug. 27 = 737: Varius et Tucca, Vergili et Horati contubernales, poetae habentur illustres (we do not know from other sources that Tucca was himself a poet) qui Aeneidum postea libros emendarunt sub lege ea ut nihil adderent. Serv. prooem. to Aen. p. 1 sq. L.: postea ab Augusto Aeneidem propositam scripsit, annis undecim; sed nec emendavit nec edidit, unde eam moriens praecepit incendi. Augustus vero, ne tantum opus periret, Tuccam et Varium hac lege iussit emendare ut superflua demerent, nihil adderent tamen. Doubtful instances of their editorial labour are quoted by Servius on Aen. II 567—588 (cf. K. Kappes, on the explanation of the Aeneid, Freiburg 1859.) IV 436. V 871. VII 468. See also the Prolegg. Vergil. p. 90—95. 'Superflua demere' can only be understood of various readings, but cannot be traced now with anything like certainty. But see also Gell. XVII 10, 6 sq,: quae procrastinata sunt ab eo, ut post recenserentur, et absolvi quoniam mors praeverterat nequiverunt, nequaquam poetarum elegantissimi nomine atque iudicio digna sunt. itaque cum morbo oppressus adventare mortem videret petivit oravitque a suis amicissimis impense ut Aeneida, quam nondum satis elimavisset, adolerent.

3. The conjecture of L. Lersch (School-Gazette for South-Germany IV 2 p. 88 sqq.) that the Aeneid was originally calculated to fill 24 books, each of the size of a book of the Georgics, and that the present division was not by Virgil himself, may only be supported by the analogy of the Homeric poems (though this may also have prevented a modest poet like Virgil), but is contradicted by the express testimony of Donatus (or rather Suetonius), vita 23 (34). The opinion that Virgil should have intended to pursue his subject beyond the death of Turnus to the final settlement of Aeneas in Latium, is at variance with all the information we possess, and with distinct hints in the poem itself: see XII 803. 819 sqq. 833 sqq. See W. Herzberg's translation p. IV sq.

4. In a work confessedly unfinished and destined by its author to destruction it is a mere matter of course that — besides the great artistic blemishes, on which see n. 5 — there should be blemishes in detail, incongruities, gaps, contradictions, errors of memory and calculation. Markland already (praef. to Stat. Silv.) observed that in the Aeneid nonnulla sunt contradictoria, multa languida, exilia, nugatoria,

spiritu et maiestate carminis heroici defecta, and Peerlkamp (in his edition of the Aeneid, Lugd. Bat. 1843) traced these blemishes in his peculiar manner, by inferring the existence of interpolations. (Against Peerlkamp see J. Freudenberg, Vindiciar. Virg. spec., Bonn 1845. 4. J. Siebelis, in Aen. ab H. P. editae librum I. adnotationes, Hildburgh. 1845. 29 pp. 4. S. J. E. Rau, de verss. spuriis in Aen. I., Leyden 1845. Jahn's Jahrb. XLIII. p. 3—53.) Incongruent passages in the first six books are pointed out by Fr. Conrads, Quaestiones Virgilianae, Treves 1863. 4.; throughout the whole poem Ribbeck Prolegg. p. 59—87 follows the example of Peerlkamp, and even attempts the hopeless task of discriminating what blemishes may be due to the imperfect state of the poem, and which to interpolation. That all books (though to a different extent) are devoid of final polish is proved by the imperfect lines which occur in all, 58 altogether. See also Th. Ladewig, on some passages of Virgil, Neustrelitz 1853. 25 pp. 4.

5. The belief that the Romans were descended from a Trojan colony led by Aeneas into Latium, in the Sibylline books called Aeneadae, may perhaps originally have been implanted in the Roman nobles by vain Greeks, but was officially used at Rome as early as the first Punic war: see Justin. XXVIII 1, 5 sq. Suet. Claud. 25. This connexion with the Trojans subsequently became one of the standing beliefs with Roman historians and poets. A. Scheben, de poetis Aeneae fugam atque fata ante Virgilium describentibus, Münstereifel 1828. 4. It was especially connected with the supposed emigration of the Trojan Penates to Latium (Lavinium): W. Hertzberg on the Aeneid p. 334—338, and in general Schwegler, Roman History I p. 279 sqq. especially 307 sqq. But this legend had not received special treatment before Virgil. In the time of Augustus, the national motive was still further increased by the interest of the reigning dynasty, whose legendary tradition was that Aeneas through his son Iulus (= Ascanius) was the ancestor of the gens Iulia. Virgil chiefly dwells on this providential mission of his hero, and forgets to represent him acting. Throughout, Virgil formed his hero too much in imitation of himself: soft-hearted, given to tears, full of piety, accessible to the noblest feelings, but without personal energy, always led and pushed on by the gods or by others. Like the tender progenitor of a noble race he is anxiously watched by the gods, and conscious of his great task he shuns dangerous adventures as much as possible. This is indeed a critical position for the hero of an epic poem, and hence arises a great deal of the dullness of the Aeneid. Besides this, the whole legend of Aeneas was the production of reflection, which had no roots in national tradition, no ramification with public life, and Virgil had first to gain such connexion for it. He endeavours to keep down all doubts by consistently and intentionally identifying Trojan and Hellenic peculiarities with those of Italy, and by blending legend and history; but through this something untrue, contradictory and characterless has invaded his narrative, an uncertainty of his whole basis and tone which could not be repaired

by any local colouring which Virgil certainly endeavoured to realize and frequently did realize. See his letter to Augustus in Macrob. I 24, 11: paene vitio mentis tantum opus ingressus mihi videor, cum praesertim . . alia quoque studia ad id opus multoque potiora impertiar. Ib. 16 sq. the poet's knowledge of ius pontificium and ius augurale conspicuous in the Aeneid is praised; III 1, 6 sqq. the same praise is given in reference to inferorum deorum cultus; 2, 7 his profunda scientia, as seen in his verborum proprietas in descriptions of sacrifices; I 24, 18 it is stated that he astrologiam totamque philosophiam . . operi suo ... adspersit. So also Serv. on Aen. VI in.: totus quidem Vergilius scientia plenus est etc.; on II 57: saepe dictum est Vergilium inventa occasione mentionem iuris pontificii facere in quacunque persona. See also Niebuhr, Roman History I[3] p. 112. 217 sq. Helliez, Géographie de Virg., Paris 1771. 1820. Bonstetten, Voyage sur la scène des dix derniers livres de l'Énéide, Geneva 1804 sq. H. Töpfer, Virgilii geographia in Aeneide exhibita, Arnstadt 1828—1834, 4 Partt. 4. C. N. Osiander, de carmine epico Virgilii vere populari, Stuttg. 1816. 4. L. Lersch, de morum in Virg. Aen. habitu, Bonn 1836; on the idea and antiquarian importance of the Aeneid, in the Museum of the Rhenish and Westphalian teachers II 1 p. 18—35, and: Antiquitates Vergilianae, ad vitam populi rom. descriptae, Bonn 1843. A. Göbel in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 89, p. 658—662. Ch. Muff, antiquitates rom. in Virg. Aen. illustratae, Halle 1864. A. Noël, Virgile et l'Italie, Paris 1865.

6. Macrob. I 24, 18: praedicarim quanta de Graecis cautus et tamquam aliud agens modo artifici dissimulatione modo professa imitatione transtulerit. But Asconius defended Virgil against charges circa historiam fere et quod pleraque ab Homero sumpsisset (vita 46 = 64). From the Homeric poems Virgil derived his whole poetical economy and style as well as numerous details, especially the trick of commencing with the latter part of the 'errores' of Aeneas and making him describe his preceding adventures in the way of episode; in the same way, b. VI is entirely in the style of the Odyssey (XI), and the first half of the Aeneid may be said to be in imitation of the Odyssey, while the second half imitates the Iliad. Its whole tone and spirit are, of course, diametrically opposed to the Iliad. Besides the works quoted above 211, 5 the following may be consulted: A. G. Walch, de eo quod nimium est in imitatione Homeri Virgiliana, Schleusi. 1733. 4. J. A. H. Tittmann, de Virg. Homerum imitante, Wittenb. 1787. 4. F. Seybold, a comparison of Virgil and Homer, with notes on the criticism of the former, Pirmasens 1789. 4. G. C. Lauter, de Virg. imitatore Homeri, Heidelb. 1796. 4. Andreae, locorum Homero-Virgilian. spec. I. II., Jena 1804. 1814. H. Müller, Hom. and Virgil, a Parallel, Erfurt 1807. J. Eckert, A Parallel between the Iliad and Virgil's Aeneid, München 1829. 4. K. A. Steinmetz, de aliquot locis Odysseae et Aen. ad orci maniumque descriptionem pertinentibus, Merseb. 1840. 4. H. Wederer, Homer, Virgil, Tasso, Münster 1843; and: On the Episodes in the Aeneid, Museum of the Rhenish and Westphalian teachers I p. 78

sqq. L. Müller, de re metr. p. 219. 223. 307. 322. M. Wilms, qua ratione Verg. in Aen. aut locuturum aliquem aut locutum esse indicaverit, Duisburg 1865. 4. The subject of the second book is derived from the Cyclic poets (perhaps Pisander, Macrob. V 2, 4). The fourth book is imitated from Apollonius Rhodius (Iason and Medea). Among the Roman poets, Virgil has chiefly imitated Ennius (see e. g. VI 846), as Servius points ont in many passages of his commentary and also Macrob. VI 1 sq.; Gell. I 21, 7 (cf. Macrob. l. l.) also observes non verba sola, sed versus prope totos et locos quoque Lucreti plurimos sectatum esse Vergilium. Occasional coincidences in expressions with Naevius, A. Furius, and other Roman epic poets seem to be merely accidental. — In general see Kuschel, on the sources of Virgil's Aeneid, Breslau 1858. 32 pp. 4.

7. "It is true that Virgil is far from the pompous tirades of his tiresome imitators, but even as it is, we have a sufficient residue of artificial pathos which chiefly vents itself in ponderous epithets, though their power is weakened by immoderate repetition. The adjective ingens is for instance used in the Aeneid 152 times, immanis 43 times." W. Hertzberg, introd. to his (German) transl. of the Aeneid, p. IV. —

8. Virgil's great accuracy in metrical elaboration has been pointed out by Luciau Müller de re metr. p. 140 sq. 183. 190 sq. It may also be maintained with regard to the Aeneid, though both the subject and want of final elaboration caused there a certain laxity. See also B. Gossrau, de hexametro Vergilii, in his edition of the Aeneid, p. 624 sqq.

9. General praises bestowed upon the Aeneid (or Virgil), by Ovid Amor. I 15, 25 sq. A. A. III 337 sq. Rem. am. 396. Trist. II 533 sqq. Prop. III 32, 65 sq. Quintil. X 1, 56. 85 sqq. Stat. Theb. XII 816 and others.

10. [Virgil's poems exercised great influence upon Italian literature and partly through it upon French and English poets. It may certainly be affirmed that the epic poetry of all Romance nations is up to the present day dependent upon the style created by Virgil.]

10. Fr. Drück, de vitiis virtutibusqe Hom. et Virg. saeculi ipsorum indole aestimandis, Stuttgart 1780. 4. C. G. Heyne, de carmine epico Virgiliano, in his edition II. p. 1—36; de rerum in Aeneide tractatarum inventione, ib. p. 37—56; censura eorum quae in Aen. oeconomia reprehendi possunt, ib. III. p. 854—859. P. F. Tissot, Études sur Virgile, comparé avec tous les poètes épiques et dramatiques des anciens et des modernes, Paris 1826. 4 vols. Segrais, l'Én. considérée par rapport à l'art de la guerre (Mém. de l'acad. des inscr. XXIV), in which respect also Napoleon I (précis des guerres de César p. 209 sqq.) accuses Virgil of great ignorance. Ferd. Winkelmann in Jahn's Archiv 1833. II. p. 566—584. L. Magnier, analyse critique et littéraire de l'Énéide, Paris 1844. Cadenbach, Prolegomena ad Virg. Aen., Essen 1844. 4. Breier, de Vergilio epico poeta recte aestimando, Lübeck 1855. 4.

12. Separate editions by B. F. Schmieder (Berlin 1800. 2 vols), E. Th. Hohler (Wien 1826 sq. 2 vols), C. Thiel (Berl. 1834. 1838. 2 vols.), P. Hofman-Peerlkamp (ed. et adnot. instruxit, Lugd. 1843), G. W. Gossrau (in us. schol. annot. perp., Quedlinb. 1846). On b. I and II notes by A. Weidner, Leipz. 1869.

13. J. Stanko, de P. Victorii commentariis originalibus ineditis in libr. IV Aeneidos, München 1851. 4. J. Henry, notes of a twelve years' voyage of discovery in the first six books of the Eneis, Dresden 1853. 588 pp.; a German version of which is given in his Adversaria Virgiliana Philologus XI p. 480—532. 597—642. XII p. 248—270. XIII p. 629—644. XVII p. 627—648. K. Kappes, Contribution to the explanation of Virgil's Aeneid, I. Freiburg 1859. II. Constanz 1863. J. M. van Gent, annotationes criticae in Aen., Lugd. Bat. 1864. G. Friedreich, A contribution to the explanation of the second book of the Aeneid II. Teschen 1868. 4. [English translations by Dryden, and the best by the late Professor Conington.]

225. Besides these great and undoubtedly genuine works of Virgil we possess also a number of smaller poems which bear his name with less justice. Among these,

1) Culex is so far attested that it is quite certain that Virgil in his early youth wrote a small epic poem of this name, and which also was on pretty much the same subject; but the general character of the poem we have renders it probable that an imitation — which may, however, have been composed only a few years after Virgil's death — has occupied the place of the original production which Virgil himself destroyed.

1. Donatus' vita 17 (28): poeticam puer adhuc auspicatus in Balistam ludi magistrum ob infamiam latrociniorum coopertum lapidibus distichon fecit: monte sub hoc etc. deinde Catalecton et Priapeia et Epigrammata et Diras, item Cirim et Culicem cum esset annorum XVI. (Here follows an analysis of the latter). (19 = 30.) scripsit etiam de qua ambigitur Aetnam. mox cum res romanas inchoasset . . ad Bucolica transiit. Donatus would therefore seem to consider all these poems as works of Virgil's youth. Servius (introd. to his commentary on the Aeneid) p. 1: primum a Vergilio hoc distichon factum est in Balistam latronem: monte etc. scripsit etiam septem sive octo libros hos: Cirin, Aetnam, Culicem, Priapeia, Catalecton, Epigrammata, Copam, Diras. The Moretum is omitted in both these lists. Both, however, are so uncritical that we can scarcely hold Suetonius accountable for these statements: they merely show what were considered Virgil's youthful poems and were usually added as an appendix to his other works in the time of Donatus and Servius. In subsequent centuries this collection was still further increased by late productions; see below 5, n. 6.

2. Of the mss. of the so-called minor poems the Helmstadiensis is by far the most copious. Of the others one class contains Aetna, Ciris, Catalecta etc., the other Culex, Copa, Moretum and the Vir bonus etc. The most complete of the first class is the codex Rhedigeranus. Others are compiled from both classes together. A description of these mss. is given in Ribbeck's Appendix Vergil. p. 24—38. See also R. Peiper in the Berlin Zeitschrift f. Gymn. W. 1868 p. 770—777.

3. The carmina minora were especially collected by Sillig in the fourth volume of the edition of Heyne and Wagner, and in the fourth volume of Ribbeck's Virgil (Appendix Vergiliana; Lipsiae 1866), and in his edition of the text.

4. Besides Donatus (n. 1) we may quote the following testimonies in favour of the composition of a Culex by Virgil. Sueton. vita Lucani (p. 50 Rffsch.): ut praefatione quadam aetatem et initia sua cum Vergilio comparans ausus sit dicere: et quantum mihi restat ad Culicem! Cf. Stat. Silv. II 7, 73 sq.: haec primo iuvenis canes sub aevo, ante annos Culicis maroniani. Statius seems to have been of opinion that Virgil wrote his Culex at the age of XXVI (not XVI) years. Stat. Silv. I praef.: et Culicem legimus et Batrachomyomachiam etiam agnoscimus; nec quisquam est illustrium poetarum qui non aliquid operibus suis stilo remissiore praeluserit. It appears that his impression was that he still possessed Virgil's Culex, though he did not think much of its poetical value. Martial XIV 185 (after two epigrams on the Batrachomyomachia): accipe facundi Culicem, studiose, Maronis, ne nucibus positis Arma virumque legas. The poem attributed to Virgil had not yet then passed into the editions of the works of Virgil; but Martial did not doubt its authenticity: see also VIII 56, 19 sq.: protinus Italiam concepit et Arma virumque qui modo vix Culicem fleverat ore rudi. Nor did Nonius' authority (perhaps Probus) doubt ib. p. 211: labrusca, genere feminino, Verg. in Bucolicis (V 7); neutro Vergilius in Culice (v. 53). On account of these authorities Näke (on Val. Cat. Dir. I. p. 227), W. Teuffel (in Pauly's Enc. VI 2. 1851. p. 2657), Ribbeck (Rhein. Mus. XVIII. p. 100 sq. Append. Verg. p. 20—22) considered the Culex which we possess as the genuine poem of Virgil. It is however quite possible that Martial and Statius were deceived in identifying the extant poem with the genuine work. Its separate existence and circulation in the time of Martial is calculated to excite suspicion. The original motive of the poem can only have been the idea that the gnat could not rest in Hades and therefore asked the shepherd whose life it had saved for a decent burial. But this very motive without which the whole poem loses its consistency, is missing in the extant Culex, where the only aim of the poet is to give a very full description of Hades. Besides this we should notice the frequent imitations of all the extant works of Virgil (especially of the sixth Eclogue and the sixth book of the Aeneid, see Fr. Baur p. 371—373), though they are not so flagrant as in the Ciris.

5. There is no divergence of opinions concerning the poetical value of the extant Culex, in 412 hexameters. It is admitted to be just as tirolike as regards composition and execution, as it is masterly in point of metrical treatment. In this respect, "accuracy in metrical details and great nicety in the avoidance of harshness" (W. Hertzberg p. 51) are conspicuous in it. But some scholars (e. g. Ribbeck) conceive it possible to explain this on the assumption of its being an early work, while others (W. Hertzberg, Fr. Baur, L. Müller de re metr. p. 42) interpret this onesided technical elaboration side by side with faultiness in all other respects as a proof of the un-Virgilian origin of the poem, although it might possibly have arisen in the Augustan period (which is the opinion of Baur, but W. Hertzberg assigns it to the first half of the first century of the Christian era, between Ovid and Persius). An accurate analysis and criticism of the Culex is given by W. Hertzberg in the introd. to his translation, p. 5—25. Fr. Baur, is the extant Culex an early work of Virgil? in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 93 p. 357—377.

6. M. Haupt, Emendations in the text of the Culex, Monthly Transactions of the Academy at Berlin 1858, p. 646—659. Ribbeck, Conjectures on the Culex, Rhein. Mus. XVIII p. 100—112.

2) Ciris, the account of the treacherous conduct of the Megarian princess Scylla against her father Nisus, and her transformation into the bird Ciris. This small epic poem seems to have arisen in the circles of Messala, and is dedicated to his son, Consul 751. The author draws largely upon Virgil's poetry, though he also imitates Catullus and repeatedly reminds us of passages in Lucretius, Tibullus, and some other Augustan poets. In its refined descriptions of psychic events the poem recalls Virgil's manner. The metrical treatment is less careful, but the style more lively.

1. Nothing may be adduced in favour of the Virgilian origin of these 541 hexameters, but all is against it, nor does the author himself pretend to authorship of this kind, but in the opening lines of the poem gives a pretty extensive statement as to his personal circumstances. He represents himself as a man of advanced age, who after an eventful (political) life would fain retire from public life and write a didactic poem on Epicurean philosophy. His name is unknown. Cornelius Gallus (as Voss had conjectured, so as to make Virgil guilty of theft from the Ciris) cannot have written it: see W. Hertzberg p. 53—55. The conjecture (of W. Teuffel, Pauly's Encycl. VI 2 p. 2657) that Messala (v. 54) who is v. 36 addressed as iuvenum doctissime is the eldest son of the orator Messala, Messalinus (A. Haakh, ibid. p. 235 5 sq. nr 100), Cons. 751, has also been approved of by W. Hertzberg p. 55 and Ribbeck Append. q. 16. The poem would then seem to have been

written between 735 and 740. L. Müller de re metr. p. 42 alleges as a further proof of the origin of this poem in the Augustan time that in it the elegies of Catullus and the epic poem de Peleo et Theti are imitated, while after Augustus only Catullus' iambics and hendecasyllabics were imitated.

2. The extensive purloining from Virgil (who is laid under contribution for whole lines, cf. v. 96 sq. 125. 167. 185. 210. 232. 267. 299. 302. 318. 349. 370. 398. 405 sq. 430. 437. 474. 538 sqq.), from Catullus (v. 168 sqq. 177 sqq. 195 sqq. 241. 350. 387 sqq. 442. 511; cf. M. Haupt, Quaest. Catull. p. 45. 75 sq. Observ. crit. p. 6. 14) and other poets, is traced by Schrader, Emendationes p. 34 sqq., cf. Sillig IV. p. 155 sqq. There are deviations from Virgil's usage, chiefly in the use of particles, see Jacob on Propert. p. 165 and in Sillig IV p. 143 sq. Haupt, Obs. crit. p. 48. For deviations from his metrical peculiarities see W. Hertzberg p. 51 note, whose introduction contains the best criticism on the poem. See also Ribbeck, Appendix Vergil. p. 16—18. In general, the author's manner approaches Catullus' (and Ovid's) style more closely than Virgil's.

3. That the subject-matter of this poem is derived from a Greek (i. e. Alexandrine) original, is evidenced partly by the mythological character of the subject, partly by the express mention made of Palaephatus (v. 88), and by the derivation of the name of Ciris from κείρειν (v. 488). It is, however, uncertain whether Callimachus or Parthenius (Meineke, Anal. alex. p. 273) or somebody else was the author of the Greek work.

4. F. W. Graser, Epist. ad Richter., qua I. Silligii de Cir. poem. exordio disputatio examinatur, Guben 1835. 4. Critical contributions by M. Haupt (Quaestiones Catull. p. 75—78; Monthly transactions of the Academy at Berlin, 1858, p. 659—671), G. Pütz (Adnotationes ad Virg. Cirin, Cologne 1845. 4.), Ribbeck (Rhein. Mus. XVIII p. 112—122).

3) Moretum, a pleasant idyl of the time of Virgil and perhaps translated by him from a Greek poem of Parthenius, full of vivid and detailed description and amiable humour, the form also being masterly.

1. J. G. Vossius, de poet. gr. 9 states that in a cod. Ambros. this poem bore the heading: Parthenius Moretum scripsit in Graeco, quem Virgilius imitatus est. This may perhaps account for the fact that the fresh and lively style and vivid description (see W. Teuffel, Pauly's Encycl. VI 2 p. 2658), and the candid undisguised appellation of things observed in this poem (W. Hertzberg p. 95) do not agree with Virgil's general manner. W. Hertzberg (p. 95. 100. 101 sq.) has justly concluded from the name of Simplus, the metre of v. 18 and from v. 116, that the Greek original was pretty faithfully translated. The 124 hexameters of this poem describe how the peasant Simplus rises at dawn,

bakes his bread, prepares his 'moretum' and then sets to work. Suevius also had written a Moretum (above 25, 2), and it is not altogether improbable that the desire to surpass Suevius influenced Virgil in attempting the same task again. At all events, the poem belongs to the best time of Roman literature, as appears e. g. from the estimation in which the lactuca is held v. 76 as compared with the time of Martial (Mart. XIII 14, 1): see Stander, Ztschr. f. AW. 1853, p. 290. Lachmann on Lucret. p. 326: in Moreto, quod carmen Vergilianis aetate par esse existimo. M. Haupt, Quaest. Catull. p. 52. W. Hertzberg's Introduction p. 93—96. Ribbeck Appendix p. 14 sq.

2. F. G. Klopfer, Moretum quod vulgo Virgilio abscribitur, cum versione vernacula et animadversionibus, Zwickau 1806. 4. Schneidewin in Jahn's Archiv II p. 426 sq. Chr. Jahn ibid. IV (1836). p. 627—639. M. Haupt, Quaest. Catull. p. 49—53. Stauder, on Virgil's Moretum, Zeitschr. f. AW. 1853, nr. 37 sq.

4) Copa ('mine hostess'), a short elegy of the best time, in style and diction quite agreeable to Virgil's manner, but much less reminding us of him in its sprightly contents and tone; many passages of it remind the reader of Virgilian expressions.

1. These 19 distichs are ascribed to Virgil in some mss. and by Charisius; see Charis. I. p. 47 P. = 63. 11 K.: quamvis Vergilius librum suum Cupam inscripserit. Lachmann on Lucret. III 374. p. 164 quotes Vergilius . . in Copa 31. The agreement of the Copa with Virgil's practice in his pentameters, has been proved by Hertzberg p. 105, but p. 104 the same agreement is traced with Propertius (Catullus not being admissible in point of time), and p. 103 he says "the distinct description of details, the brevity of expression, the volubility of the sentences, and the sprightliness which pervades the whole poem, are not qualities in general belonging to Virgil." v. 27 cantu rumpunt arbusta cicadae = Georg. III 328; v. 35 cineri ingrato = Aen. VI 213; cf. umbrosis harundinibus (v. 8) with Aen. VIII 34 umbrosa harundo. V. 31 = Calpurn. ecl. XI 46. Appendix Vergil. p. 14. There is certainly no reason for removing the poem beyond the Augustan period.

2. C. D. Ilgen, Animadversiones philolog. et criticae in carmen Virg. quod Copa inscribitur, Halle 1820. 4. (considers Valgius Rufus as author, though on insufficient grounds). Heyne-Sillig IV p. 281 sqq. K. Zell, Vacation-Writings I p. 5—52. W. Müller, Rome and Roman Ladies II p. 171 sqq.

5) Catalecta, a collection of fourteen poems in elegiac and iambic metre and on various subjects. Only two of them are attested as coming from the poet himself, but only very few can be positively proved to be not by him. This much may be stated that all belong to the period of Virgil.

1. Ausonius grammaticomast. (Idyll. 12) 5 sq.: dic quid significent Catalecta Maronis? in his (2, 3) al Celtarum posuit, sequitur non lucidius tau. In the mss. these poems are called catalepton and cathelepton, for which reason Bergk (Rh. Mus. XX p. 291) considers *κατὰ λεπτόν* to be the genuine name, a title much less suitable for a collection of miscellaneous poems than *κατάλεκτα*. But Prolusiones (jocular poems of Virgil's youth) seems to have been the title chiefly given to the Priapeia which were erroneously ascribed to the poet: see Diomed. III p. 512 P. and K.: Priapeum, quo Virgilius in prolusionibus suis usus fuit, tale est: incidi patulum in specum procumbente Priapo, a meaningless line made, as the sequel shows, by the grammarian as a specimen of the metre without any claim of being Virgilian. There are three Priapeia of this kind at the head of the whole collection (Append. Vergil. p. 147—150), the first very short and insignificant, v. 1 with faulty synizesis and resembling Martial VIII 40 in its drift; the second (in iambic senarii) and the third (in Priapeius) variations of the same theme, without any settled authorship: see W. Hertzberg p. 110 sq. Append. Verg. p. 4 sq. That Pliny Ep. V 3, 6 mentions P. Vergilius (above 26, 1) among the boni who wrote erotic 'lusus', is fully counterbalanced by the silence of Ovid who (Trist. II 535—538) mentions only the fourth book of the Aeneid and the Bucolics in this department. See also J. E. Wernicke, Priapeia (Thorn 1853) p. 9—11. 108—112. F. Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. XVIII p. 383.

2. In the collection of the Catalecta, nr. 1, 6, 9—14 are in elegiacs, 3, 4, 5 and 8 in iambics, 2 and 7 in choliambics. nr. 2 (on Annius Cimber above 206, 12) is attested authentic by Quintil. VIII 3, 28 and Ausonius (see n. 1). A definite proof against Virgil's authorship is furnished only by n. 5, the first lines of which contain allusions to personal circumstances of the author's which are at variance with those of Virgil. The servile elegy to Messala (nr. 11) of a. 727 cannot be by Virgil (see e. g. v. 17), but should be assigned to a tiro displaying his mythological learning and imitating rather Ovid's than Virgil's manner. Ribbeck App. Verg. p. 12 sq. ascribes it to Lygdamus (below 240, 4), a conjecture at least more credible than R. Unger's pleading for Valgius Rufus (de Valgio Rufo p. 304 sqq.). The acerbity of the iambic poems (especially nr. 3 sq. and 8) is not much in harmony with Virgil's later soft character, but may be sufficiently explained by his fiery youth, the general excitement of the period, and the example of Catullus. These poems, the quotation from Catullus in 3, 6, the parody of a poem of Catullus' in nr. 8, and the choliambics nr. 7, also a reminiscence of Catullus in nr. 13, lead to the assumption of a period in Virgil's poetical developement in which he was under the influence of Catullus' manner and style. Nr. 6, 7, 10 are in perfect agreement with Virgil's personal circumstances; 1, 9, 13, 14 are addressed to men of his acquaintance. On the whole question see W. Hertzberg's introd. to his German translation of the Catalecta, p. 108—110, and Ribbeck's Appendix Vergil. p. 6—14. L. Müller's Catullus (1870) p. XLIII—XLVI.

3. In the edition by Heyne and Wagner, IV p. 341—382. F. Fiedler, ex Verg. Catalectis epigramm. VII et Copa, Wesel 1830. 4. F. Näke, Valer. Caton. (1847) p. 221 sqq. M. Haupt, Emendationes Catalect. Vergil., Berlin 1859. 13 pp. 4.

4. A specimen of the 'epigrammata' meant in the list of Donatus and Servius (above 1, n. 1) may be seen in the epigram on Balista, There were, perhaps, others in existence at an earlier time, or perhaps this was the older title of the collection subsequently styled Catalecta. Poems in heroic measure (like Vir bonus and Est et non) could never be styled 'Epigrammata'.

5. In some mss. (see Append. Verg. p. 24) three late poems, de viro bono et prudente, de est et non monosyllabis, de rosis nascentibus et senescentibus, were ascribed to Virgil; they appear in the Latin anthologies of Burmann and H. Meyer, and in Ribbeck's Appendix Verg. p. 181 sqq., also 15 hexameters Ad puerum in Riese's Anth. lat. 781. The elegy entitled Rosetum (in 50 lines) cannot be earlier than the fourth century of the Christian era on account of its diction and style; it is also found in a ms. of Ausonius. The 25 hexameters on Est et non ('ay and nay') are in several mss. attributed to Priscianus eloquentissimus, as it seems the grammarian, nor can they be much earlier. The 26 hexameters on Vir bonus contain variations on some ideas of Horace (especially S. II 7, 36 sq. Ep. II 2, 206 sqq.) and frequently coincide with the apocryphal *χρυσᾶ ἔπη*. See Näke, Val. Cat. p. 240.

6. Also two elegies on Maecenas (Append. Verg. p. 193 sqq.) bear in two mss. the name of Virgil, and their careful execution justifies us in ascribing them to the first century of the Christian era; cf. L. Müller de re metr. p. 52 (Rh. Mus. XXIII 657 sq.) and Ribb. Append. p. 61.

7. As concerns prose-writings by Virgil, wo know only of his correspondence with Augustus, which was no doubt published by Augustus' order . Specimens of it in Donatus' vita Verg. 31 (and in Macrob. I 24, 11 (above 224, 5). Cf. Tac. dial. 13 (testes Augusti epistulae), Claudian. Epist. 3, 23 (dignatus tenui Caesar scripsisse Maroni), and the judgment of Seneca the Elder exc. controv. III 8. p. 361, 14 sq. Bu.: Vergilium illa felicitas ingenii in oratione soluta reliquit.

226. Virgil's poems were at an early time admitted into schools, imitated, translated, and commented on: one of the earliest and most important commentators was M. Valerius Probus, a later one Servius. We still possess the commentary of the latter, and fragments of other works in the various collections of Scholia. But Virgil's poems were also used for centos, and superstition employed them for the purpose of consulting them as an oracle. Virgil himself was in popular belief gradually turned into a magician, upon whose name all

nations of the West accumulated their fantastical fictions and legends for a long time in the Middle ages.

1. Suet. gramm. 16: Q. Caecilius Epirota . . primus dicitur . . Vergilium et alios poetas novos praelegere coepisse. Quintil. I 8, 5: optime institutum est ut ab Homero atque Vergilio lectio inciperet. Oros. I 18: Aeneae . . adventus in Italiam quae arma commoverit . . ludi litterarii disciplina nostrae quoque memoriae inustum est. Augustin. civ. dei I 3: apud Vergilium, quem propterea parvuli legunt ut videlicet poeta magnus omniumque praeclarissimus atque optimus teneris ebibitus animis non facile oblivione possit aboleri. Iul. Capitol. Clod. Albin. 5, 2: fertur in scholis saepissime cantasse inter puerulos „Arma amens" etc. (Aen. II 314). Auson. epigr. 137, 1: Arma virumque docens atque Arma virumque peritus. Augustin. Confess. I 17 shows that it was school-practice to turn passages from Virgil into prose. — On the other hand, themata vergiliana were set as metrical exercises; see above 23, 2 and n. 2.

2. Ovid (e. g. Met. I 155. III 501) often alludes to Virgil (Zingerle II p. 48—113). The Aeneid (II 77) is also quoted by Phaedrus, fab. III praef. 27, by Sulpicia Sat. 32 (Ae. I 279), Juvenal II 99 sq. III 197. IX 102. See Wehle, Observ. in Petron. p. 44 sqq. Ribbeck prolegg. crit. p. 200 sq. Livy derives much of his diction from Virgil, Tacitus even more; see E. Wölfflin, Philol. XXVI p. 130—132. For the use made of Virgil in the schools of the rhetoricians comp. Serv. Aen. X 18: et Titianus et Calvus (Var. Catulinus), qui themata omnia de Vergilio elicuerunt et adformaverunt ad dicendi usum. Cf. Ribbeck prolegg. p. 188. Passages from Virgil were found scribbled on the walls at Pompeii, especially Ecl. VIII 70, II 56. Aen. II in. Rhein. Mus. XII p. 250 sq. On a silver spoon was found Ecl. II 17; on a relief at the Villa Albani Aen. I 607 sqq. above the head of a seller of game. O. Jahn, Ber. der sächs. Ges. d. W. 1861, p. 365. For the use of Virgilian passages on tombstones see Marini fratr. Arv. p. 826 sq. papiri dipl. p. 332 sq. Quotations incidental to every day-life: Suet. Dom. 9. Dio LXXV 10. Lamprid. Diadum. 8, 7. Vopisc. Tac. 5, 1. Car. 13, 3. Apulei. apol. 56 mentions that Aemilianus was nicknamed Mezentius ob deorum contemtum, and many other instances might be mentioned.

3. Q. Glitius Felix, Vergilianus poeta, on an inscription found at Rome, ap. Orelli 1179. But all the Roman epic and didactic poets are more or less imitators of Virgil, chiefly Persius, Valerius Flaccus, Statius, Silius Italicus, Ausonius, Prudentius, Paulinus (L. Müller de re metr. p. 136). The beginning of a cento-like employment of Virgil's poems may be traced as early as in the Ciris; see above 225, 2. n. 2. At a later time we have Ausonius' cento nuptialis and others; see above 29, 3. F. Hasenbalg, de centonibus Vergilianis, Putbus 1846. 4. W. H. D. Suringar, Anonymi cento Vergilianus de ecclesia, Utrecht 1867. A. Rosaeus turned the Aeneid into a Christiad: Virgilii evangelisantis Christiados libri XIII, Tigur. 1664.

4. Virgil's poems were consulted like oracles, to act upon passages as advice in difficult positions of life, and sortes Vergilianae were even publicly kept in the temples, see Iul. Capitol. Clod. Albin. 5, 4: in templo Apollinis Cumani . . cum sortem de fato suo tolleret, his versibus ei dicitur esse responsum (Aen. VI 857 sq.). Lamprid. Alex. Sev. 4, 6: huic sors in templo Praenestinae talis exstitit (Aen. VI 882). 14, 5: ipse . . Vergilii sortibus huiusmodi illustratus est (Ae. VI 848 sqq.). Spartian. Hadr. 2, 8: cum sollicitus . . Vergilianas sortes consuleret, Quis procul etc. (Ae. VI 808 sqq.) sors excidit. Trebell. Poll. Claud. 10, 4 sqq.: cum in Apennino de se consuleret responsum huiusmodi accepit (Ae. I 265); item cum de posteris suis (Ae. I 278); item cum de fratre (Ae. VI 669). Schwarz, de sortibus poeticis, Altorf 1712 = diss. sel. p. 17 sqq. In the Middle ages the fourth eclogue was on account of its prophetic tone interpreted of the Messiah: see Th. Creizenach, the Aeneid, the fourth eclogue, and the Pharsalia in the Middle ages. Frankf. on the M. 1864. 37 pp. 4. A remnant of this is pointed out above 222, 6; see also F. Piper, Virgil considered as the theologer and prophet of the Heathen in the Christian Church, Berlin 1862 (Evangelical Calendar of 1862, p. 17—83). Virgil was even said to have had a hand in the conversion of the emperor Constantine; cf. Rossignol, Virgile et Constantin le grand, Paris 1845.

5. Arrianus (above 223, 2) seems to have translated Virgil; comp. also Sen. Consol. ad Polyb. 8, 2: Homerus et Vergilius, tam bene de humano genere meriti quam tu et de omnibus et de illis meruisti, quos pluribus notos esse voluisti quam scripserant.

6. On the ancient commentators of Virgil see Ribbeck prolegomena critica c. 9, p. 114—200, where we find discussions on Q. Caecilius Epirota, Pollio, C. Iulius Hyginus, Iulius Modestus, L. Annaeus Cornutus, Aemilius Asper, M. Valerius Probus (p. 136—165), Flavius Caper, Urbanus, Velius Longus, Q. Terentius Scaurus, Caesellius Vindex and Sulpicius Apollinaris, Helenius Acro, Haterianus, Aelius Donatus, Carminius, Avienus, Servius, the so-called commentarii of Probus, Iunius Philargyrius, the scholia Bernensia and scholia Veronensia. To this may be added H. Hagen's pref. to his edition of the Scholia Bernensia p. 696—708. On each of these grammarians see below, in the period to which they belong. In a ms. saec. XIV at Padua Fulgentius super Bucol. et Georg. Virgilii, certainly not by the mythologer Fulg., see Jungmann, Quaest. Fulg. p. 61. — J. M. Dozio, Cynthii Cenetensis in Vergil. Aen. commentar. (first edited by A. Mai, auct. class. VII) e cod. Ambros., Milan 1845.

7. The Bernese Scholia (on Buc. and Georg.) are professedly excerpts of the commentaries of T. Gallus, Gaudentius and Iunilius Flagrus (of Milan); see H. Hagen l. l. De scholiorum Bernensium codicibus, Hagen p. 689—696. They were first edited by C. W. Müller (Rudolstadt 1847. 1852. 1853. 1854. 4.), better by H. Hagen in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. Suppl. IV. p. 749—983, with Appendices and Indices p.

984—1014. The fragmentary Scholia Veronensia were first edited from a palimpsest at Verona by A. Mai, reprinted in Lion's edition of Servius II p. 305 sqq., and best edited by H. Keil, M. Valerii Probi in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica commentarius (p. 1—68). accedunt scholiorum Veronensium (p. 71—108) et Aspri quaestionum Vergilianarum (p. 111—115) fragmenta, Halle 1848. To this add Rhein. Mus. VI. p. 369 sqq. and in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 93, p. 65—72. See also G. Thilo, Contributions towards the criticism of the Scholiasts on Virgil, Rhein. Mus. XIV p. 535 sqq. XV p. 119—154. Th. Mommsen, on the Munich ms. of the Scholia on Virgil, Rhein. Mus. XVI p. 137—140. A. Riese, de commentario Vergiliano qui M. Valeri Probi dicitur, Bonn 1862. —

8. Metrical arguments on Virgil's works of saec. IV—V e. g. in Riese's Anth. lat. 1 and 2 (p. 1—10), cf. ibid. 591—602. 634. 653. sq. 874. A sort of prologue ib. 717, in 11 hexameters. L. Müller, Rhein. Mus. XIX p. 114—125, and XXIII p. 654—657. Ribbeck, Prolegg. critica p. 369—380. See below on Sulpicius Apollinaris. J. Mähly, on Virgil's argumenta Ovidio ascripta, Ztsch. f. österr. Gymn. XXII 5.

9. Of the works of Virgil we possess seven mss. in capital writing, of which three, however, contain only a number of leaves, viz. the schedae rescriptae Sangallenses (G ap. Ribb.), the schedae rescr. Veronenses (V), and the three Berlin leaves, which originally formed part of a Vatican ms. (nr. 3256). The oldest but also very incomplete ms. is the schedae Vaticanae (nr. 3225) of the second century. Of the more comprehensive, though not complete, mss. special importance attaches to the Medicean ms. (M) of the fifth century; cod. Palatinus (P), nr. 1631 in the Vatican library, of the fourth or fifth century; cod. Vaticanus nr. 3867 (R) of the fourth century. To this add the cod. Gudianus (γ) saec. IX, three Bern mss. (a, b, c) of saec. IX and X, and (of saec. X—XII) the codex Minoraugiensis (m). On these mss. see Ribbeck Prolegomena critica ad Verg. (1866) p. 218—230; de scriptura codicum antiquissimorum ib. p. 231—264; and librorum manu scriptorum rationes explicantur ib. p. 265—361 (where p. 353 de codicibus Vindobonensibus and p. 353—361 de aliis recentioris aetatis libris). The result is stated p. 361: redire omnem nostram memoriam ad unum archetypum currenti stilo parum nitide scriptum oppletumque nube coniecturarum, glossematum atque interpolationum (see above 222, 3. 224, 4). On mss. of Virgil may also be seen J. G. Eck, Varietas lect. ex cod. membr. acad. bibl. Lundensis, Lund 1844, 9 part. G. Butler, codex Vergilianus qui nuper ex bibliotheca abbatis Matt. Lud. Canonici Bodleianae accessit (stated to be of saec. XI) cum Wagneri textu collatus, Oxon. 1854. G. H. Pertz, on the Berlin and Vatican leaves etc. Berlin 1863. 4. (Trans. of the Berlin Academy) with the additam. in the Monthly Reports 1864 p. 278 sqq., and J. Henry in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 95 p. 419—423). E. Hoffmann, on some mss. of Vergil, Zeitschr. f. österr. Gym. XVI p. 129—148. 477—508. Winnefeld, on a fragment of a ms. of Virgil's Aeneid with the scholia of Servius, Eos II p. 533—540.

10. Complete editions of Virgil's poems. Conf. the Notitia literaria in the Bipont edition, in Heyne-Wagner IV p. 635—742, and Schweiger's Classical Bibliogr. II 2 p. 1145 sqq., also F. W. Wagner, Manual of classical bibliography (Breslau 1840) p. 539—547. Here only the most important are given. Ed. princ., Rome c. 1469. fol. Venet. ap. Ald. 1501. 8. and often. Cum comment. Donati, Serv. etc. per Ge. Fabricium, Basil. 1551. fol. and often. Argumentis, explicationibus et notis illustrata a J. L. de la Cerda, Madrit. 1608—1617. fol. 3 vols. E recens. Dan. Heinsii, Lugd. Bat. 1636. 12. Rec. Nic. Heinsius, Amstelod. 1676. 12. Interpretat. et notis illustr. Car. Ruaeus, in us. Delph., Paris 1675 etc. 4.; ed. noviss. opera J. J. Roquete, 3 vols. 12. Paris 1850. Cum comment. Serv., Philarg. etc., Ursini, N. Heinsii etc. ed. P. Burmann., Amstelod. 1746. 4 vols. 4. Variet. lect. et perp. adnot. illustr. a. C. G. Heyne, Lips. 1767—1775. IV vols.; ed. II. 1788; ed. III. 1798—1800. V vols.; ed. IV. cur. G. Ph. E. Wagner, Lips. 1830—1832. IV vols. (Vol. IV: Virg. quae vulgo feruntur carmm. Culex etc., rec. et Heynii suasq. obss. add. J. Sillig), to which was added 1841 Vol. V.: P. Vergili Mar. carmm. ad pristinam orthographiam . . . revocata, with Indices. An abridgment of Heyne's edition: in tironum grat. perp. adn. ill. C. G. Heyne, Lips. 1779. 1788. 1799. 2 vols., cum animadvv. ed. E. C. F. Wunderlich et F. E. Ruhkopf, ib. 1816 sq. 1822. 2 vols. Ad optim. librr. fidem recogn. et in us. schol. ed. J. Chr. Jahn, Lips. 1825. ed. II. 1838. ed. IV. 1850. Rec. et illustr. A. Forbiger, Lips. 1836—1839. ed. II. 1845. ed. III. 1852. Perpetuo comm. ad modum J. Bond explicuit Fr. Dübner, Paris (Didot) 1858. 16. Recensuit O. Ribbeck, Lips. Teubner 1859—1862, 3 vols., 1866 Prolegomena critica and (Vol. IV) 1868 Appendix Vergiliana. Oeuvres de Vergile, texte latin . . avec un commentaire critique et explicatif, une introduction etc. par E. Benoist, Paris 1867 sq. [An excellent edition by the late Professor Conington, finished by Nettleship, 3 vols., in the Bibliotheca classica, Whittaker & Bell.]

School-editions by K. F. Süpfle (Carlsruhe 1842. 1847), Ph. Wagner (breviter enarravit, Lips. 1845. 1849. 1861; with German notes by Koch, Leipz. 1849), Th. Ladewig (Berlin, Weidmann, 1850—1852; 3 vols.).

Editions of the text by Paldamus (Lips. Tauchnitz 1854, with introduction), M. Haupt (ed. nitida, Lips. Hirzel 1858), Th. Ladewig (Berlin 1866), Ribbeck (Bibl. Teubner, Lips. 1867).

11. Ph. Wagner, Quaestiones Vergilianae (in Heyne IV. p. 383—587) and Lectionum Vergilianarum libellus, Philologus Suppl. I. p. 307—426; see also Philologus XV. p. 351 sq. XVI. p. 537—542. XVII. p. 170—172. C. Regel, Quaest. Verg. criticarum specimen, Celle 1866. 30 pp. 4. Ph. Spitta, Quaestiones Vergilianae, Göttingen 1867. 47 pp. 4.

12. The great respect enjoyed by Virgil with posterity in his quality as a poet and which manifested itself also in the reverence paid to his burial-place (Plin. Ep. III 7, 8. Cf. Martial XI 48 sq.

Stat. Silv. IV 4, 51 sqq.), the superstitious use made of his poems (above n. 4), and the interpretation of his name (from virga, a magic wand) and that of his mother (maga), caused the gradual evaporation of Virgil's real character into that of a mythical being. In Donatus' vita we meet with traces of this kind, § 3—5, and in the later additions 8—18, 69 sq. and 78: the more we descend into the Middle ages, they stranger the exaggerations, the greater the resemblance of Virgil to such figures as Faustus or Theophrastus Paracelsus. But Virgil always appears as a benevolent genius fond of assisting poor humanity. Only a Roman lady who had wickedly cheated his love, must feel his revenge. Conformably to the romantic confusion of all names and times, Virgil was now placed under the fabulous Emperor Octavianus, now under King Servius (in the Seven Wise Men), now unter Titus (Gesta Rom. c. 57), now under Darius at Rome (ib. c. 120), even in Brettany under King Arthur, or he is represented as the son of a knight of 'Campania in the Ardennes' and of a daughter of a Roman Senator under the Emperor Remus, who killed his uncle Romulus and was succeeded by his son Perseus, in whose reign Virgil studied at the University of Toledo (German Popular Chapbooks p. 3—7). The scene of his exploits is at Rome and Naples. At Rome he performs miracles chiefly at the request of the Emperor who, after a vain struggle, appoints him his chief Senator, and the aim of his deeds is to insure the safety of the State (Salvatio Romae) and internal order. But at his beloved Naples which be founded and placed on eggs at the bottom of the sea, he voluntarily provides for the welfare of the town. A very odd trait in his life at Naples is that he fetches himself the daughter of the Sultan of Babylon on a bridge thrown across the air. See in general Genthe's introd. to his German translation of the eclogues, p. 58—97 = 47—85 of the sec ed. Ad. Keller, Li Romans des sept Sages, p. CCIII sq. Siebenhaar, de fabulis quae media aetate de P. Virg. circumferebantur, Berl. 1837. 4. F. Michel, quae vices quaeque mutationes et Virgilium ipsum et eius carmina per mediam aetatem exceperint, Paris 1846. Grässe, Contributions to Medieval Literature and legends, Dresden 1850. 4. II: on the legend of Virgil the magician. G. Zappert, Virgil's influence on the Middle ages (Memoirs of the Academy at Vienna, II). Schwubbe, P. Virgilius per mediam aetatem gratia et auctoritate florentissimus, Paderborn 1852. 4. K. L. Roth, on Virgil the magician, in Franz Pfeiffer's Germania IV (1859) p. 267—298; cf. K. Bartsch ibid. p. 237—240. C. G. Milberg, Memorabilia Vergiliana (Meissen 1847. 4.) and Mirabilia Vergiliana (Meissen 1867. 4.). F. Gregorovius, History of the City of Rome, conclusion of the fourth volume (1865). Comparetti, Virgilio mago ed innamorato, 1867 sqq. Les faictz merveilleux de Virgile, Geneva 1867. 64 pp. 24. (reprint of a chapbook of the 15th century.)

227. Cornelius Gallus of Forum Julii (685—728), the friend of Virgil's youth, was the first Roman poet who trans-

planted the erotic elegies of the Alexandrines into Roman soil. Through the favour of Octavianus he was raised to military and political positions, became too ambitious, and finished his life in a tragic manner.

1. Asinius Pollio ap. Cic. ad fam. X 32 extr. (a. 711): Gallum Cornelium, familiarem meum. Probus on Vergil. Buc. p. 6, 1 Keil: insinuatus Augusto per Cornelium Gallum, condiscipulum suum, promeruit (Vergilius) ut etc. Virgil's Ecl. X (a. 715) is addressed to him, and from this it appears that even then he had written poetry and experienced the faithlessness of his mistress Lycoris (above 209, 1): cf. v. 2—6. 10. 22 sqq. 72 sqq. On it Servius observes: Gallus ante omnes primus Aegypti praefectus fuit, poeta eximius. nam et Euphorionem . . transtulit in latinum sermonem et amorum suorum de Cytheride scripsit libros quattuor. . . fuit autem amicus Vergilii, adeo ut quartus Georgicorum a medio usque ad finem eius laudes teneret; see above 223, 1. cf. 220, 3. Prob. on Ecl. 10, 50: Euphorion, . . cuius in scribendo secutus colorem videtur Cornelius Gallus. Ovid Trist. II 445: nec fuit opprobrio celebrasse Lycorida Gallo. Cf. rem. am. 765. Martial. VIII 73, 6. Quintil. X 1, 93 calls him durior as an elegiac poet. See also above 206, 2. 4. 225, 2, n. 1.

2. Gallus took part in the war against Antony: Dio LI 9. Sueton. Aug. 66: Cornelium Gallum, quem ad praefecturam Aegypti (a. 724) ex infima fortuna provexerat (cf. Dio LI 17. Strab. XVII. p. 819. Eutrop. VII 7). . . ob ingratum et malevolum animum domo et provinciis suis interdixit. Gallo et accusatorum denuntiationibus et senatus consultis ad necem compulso etc. Hieronym. chron. a Abr. 1990 = Aug. 17 = Ol. 187, 2 = 26 B. Chr. = 728 v. c.: Cornelius Gallus Foroiuliensis poeta, a quo primum Aegyptum rectam supra diximus, XLIII aetatis suae anno propria se manu interfecit. See also Ovid, Trist. II 446. Amor. III 9, 63 sq. Propert. III 32, 91 sq. Dio LIII 23 sq. Ammian. Marc. XVII 4, 5. W. A. Becker's Gallus I. p. 16 sqq. — Suet. gramm. 16: Q. Caecilius Epirota . . ad Cornelium Gallum se contulit vixitque una familiarissime. . . post deinde damnationem mortemque Galli etc.

3. Jacobs assigns to Cornelius Gallus two Greek epigrams (Anal. II p. 106. Anthol. gr. II p. 93, *Γάλλου*): but this is very doubtful. On a forgery concerning Gallus see above 29, 2 fin.

4. C. Ch. C. Völker, commentatio de C. G. vita et scriptis, P. I. Bonn 1840. II. Elberfeld 1844.

228. Another friend of Virgil and, as it seems, a writer of elegies was Codrus (perhaps a pseudonym). The poets Bavius and Maevius were enemies of the poet. But of Anser hostile opposition to Virgil is commonly wrongly assumed; he was an adherent of M. Antony and wrote erotic poetry, see above 210, 8.

1. Verg. Ecl. 7, 21 sqq.: nymphae . . Libethrides, . . mihi carmen quale meo Codro concedite: proxima Phoebi versibus ille facit. Cf. ib. 25 sq. 5, 11. Similarly Valgius said of him: ille canit quali tu voce, Catulle, canebas atque soles numeros dicere, Cinna, tuos; dulcior ut nunquam pylio profluxerit ore Nestoris aut docto pectore Demodoci. See Unger, Valg. p. XI. Idle guesses at his real name (Cornificius or Cinna or even Virgil) are given by the old commentators on the passage. The most probable would be to think of the Roman name of Codrus. See R. Unger, Valg. p. 405 sqq.

2. Jerome in Eus. chron. ad a. Abr. 1982 = Ol. 186, 2 = Aug. 9 = 720 V. C.: M. Varius poeta, quem Vergilius in Bucolicis notat, in Cappadocia moritur. Porphyrio on Hor. Epo. 10, 1 sq. (p. 490 H.): hic est Maevius importunissimus poeta, quem et Vergilius consimili contumelia notat; and on Sat. II 3, 239 (p. 276 H.): de hoc (the son of Aesopus) Maevius poeta scribit. Verg. Ecl. 3, 90: qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina, Maevi; on which Servius observes: pro poena ei contingat ut diligat Maevium peiorem poetam. nam Maevius et Bavius pessimi fuerunt poetae, inimici tam Horatio quam Vergilio. unde Horatius (Epo. 10, 1 sqq.). Similarly Philargyrius, probably from Suetonius: duos sui temporis poetas dicit pessumos, quorum carmina ob humilitatem abiecta sunt . . . ex quibus Varius curator fuit, de quo Domitius in cicuta refert (that he lived with his brother in peace and community of goods, until the latter extended also to his wife). Serv. on Ecl. 7, 21: ut sit . . Thyrsis . . Vergilii obtrectator, scilicet aut Bavius aut Anser (above 210, 8) aut Maevius poetae. On Ge. I 210: reprehensus Vergilius dicitur a Bavio et Maevio hoc versu: hordea qui dixit superest ut tritica dicat (cf. Ecl. 5, 36). Weichert, poet. lat. vitae etc. p. 308—312.

229. Q. Horatius Flaccus, born 8 December 689 at Venusia, was the son of a freedman and received his instruction at Rome and subsequently (perhaps a. 709) at Athens. When Brutus came there in August 710, he also won young Horace over to his cause. Horace received from him an appointment as tribunus militum and accompanied him in Macedonia and Asia, until the battle of Philippi (in autumn 712) precipitately ended his military career. He availed himself of the amnesty to return to Rome, and having lost his paternal estate by the distribution of the land among the veterans, he purchased the position of a quaestorian scribe. He now began to publish his Satires and Epodes, through which he became known and was about the end of 715 introduced by Virgil and L. Varius to Maecenas, though he was not admitted to his circles until autumn 716. Thus it came to pass that he accompanied Maecenas on his journey to Brundisium, a. 717. From

Maecenas he received, a. 721, an estate in the Sabine country and through him he was also introduced to Octavianus. Horace died within a short time after Maecenas, on 27 November 746, and was buried near him.

1. The poems of Horace contain abundant information on his life. We derive also a number of important facts from the biography of the poet, excerpted from Suetonius de viris illustribus in the section de poetis, and preserved in many mss. of Horace. It was at an early time prefixed to mss. of his poems, especially such as contained Scholia. From the latter interpolations were added to the vita, e. g. on speculatum cubiculum (from Schol. Ep. I 19, 1: see Roth, Rh. Mus. XIII p. 531. Reifferscheid, Sueton. p. 389 sq.) On the other hand, Suetonius' life seems also to have been abbreviated for the purpose of prefixing it to mss.: see O. Jahn, ap. Reiffersch. p. 390. The text of the vita is given in C. L. Roth's edition of Suetonius p. 297 sq., cf. p. LXXX—LXXVV, also Rhein. Mus. XIII p. 517—532. F. Ritter in the Prolegg. to his edition of Horace, p. V—VII. A. Reifferscheid, C. Suetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae (Lips. 1860) p. 44—48, cf. p. 387—392. That this vita was employed by the grammarians, appears also from Porphyrio on S. I 6, 41: patre libertino natum esse Horatium et in narratione quam de vita ipsius habui ostendi. Cf. Schol. ad O. IV 1, 1 (ut refert Suetonius in vita Horatii) and ad Ep. II 1, 1 (cuius rei etiam Suetonius auctor est).

2. Reliquae Horati vitae in libris poetae . . repertae . . ne ullam quidem antiquam memoriam nisi quae ex ipsis carminibus recepta sit continent. Reifferscheid l. l. p. 387 sq. They are enumerated and criticized by C. Kirchner, Novae quaestiones horatianae (Naumburg 1847. 4.) p. 42—44 (not. 5).

3. Among modern biographies of Horace we mention especially Masson, vita Horatii, Lugd. Bat. 1708. Mitscherlich's introduction to his edition of the Odes I p. CXLIV—CLXXIX. C. Passow, on the life and period of Horace, before his edition of the Epistles. Franke, fasti horatiani p. 5—20. de Walckenaer, histoire de la vie et des poésies d'Horace, 2 vols. Paris 1840. W. Teuffel, Horace (Tübingen 1843) p. 1—13; in Pauly's Encl. III p. 1465—1469. Noël de Vergers, vie d'Horace, Étude biographique sur Horace, Paris 1855. 84 pp. with 2 maps and 6 photographic views.

4. The praenomen of Quintus rests on Sat. II 6, 37, the cognomen of Flaccus is mentioned Epod. 15, 15. S. II 1, 18. The day on which Hor. was born is given by Suetonius, the month we know from Ep. I 20, 27; the year from Epod. 13, 6. O. III 21, 1. Ep. I 20, 27 sq. The birthplace especially from S. II 1, 34 sq. The rank of his father is mentioned S. I 6, 6. 45. 86. Ep. I 20, 20. On his education S. I 6, 72 sqq. 4, 105 sqq. Instruction, Ep. II 1, 69. 2, 42 sqq. Tribunus militum, S. I 6, 48. On his military exploits with Brutus and his flight at Philippi O. II 7, where v. 9 (relicta non bene parmula) does not

exclude the possibility of previous fighting (cf. Ep. I 20, 23) and only shows the necessary consequence of all defeats; see e. g. Liv. XXXIX 20: quattuor milia militum amissa .. et arma multa, quae quia impedimento fugientibus per silvestres semitas erant passim iactabantur. Horace could not prevent the general flight, nor was he so intimately connected with the cause of Brutus that his honour should have obliged him to seek for death. Sueton.: victis partibus venia impetrata scriptum quaestorium comparavit. Comp. S. II 6, 36 with Ep. I 14, 17. The loss of his paternal estate is mentioned Ep. II 2, 50 sq.: paupertas impulit audax ut versus facerem. His poverty made him fearless of causing offence and inspired him with a desire of making himself known, in order to get into a better position. Cf. Franke, fasti hor. p. 17—20.

5. The commencement of his acquaintance with Maecenas S. I 6, 41—46, ep. II 6, 40. He got the Sabine estate a. 721: see W. Teuffel's notes on S. II p. 63 sq., and 158 sq. G. F. Grotefend, when did Horace receive his Sabine estate? Rh. Mus. III p. 471—473. The Sabine estate is especially mentioned Epod. I 25 sqq. S. II 3, 5. 308. 6, 1 sqq. 16—60 sqq. O. I 17. Ep. I 16, 1—14. On it see, besides the old works of Dom. de Sanctis (Roma 1761. 4. 1768. 4.), Capmartin de Chaupy (3 vols., Rom. 1767—1769) and Campenon: Walckenaer I p. 409—413 (with a map). Strodtmann in his translation of the lyrical poems p. 52—59. Noël de Vergers in Didot's Horace p. XXIII—XXX. P. Rosa, Villa d'Orazio, in Bull. dell' inst. arch. 1857, p. 105—110. Cf. Jahn's Jahrb. LXXVII, p. 479—481. W. Pfitzner, on the Sabine estate of Horace, Parchim 1864. 20 pp. 4. — A spring on his estate was called by Horace fons Bandusiae (*Πανδοσία*?): S. II 6, 2. cf. I 16, 12 sq., from a spring near Venusia, associated with youthful recollections. O. III 13. Cf. Strodtmann, l. l. p. 59.

6. According to his own statements Horace was in person the very reverse of Virgil (above 210, 4), short (S. II 3, 309. Ep. I 20, 24) and fat (Ep. I 4, 15), whence Augustus compared his appearance to a full-bellied sextariolus. In his youth he had dark hair (Ep. I 7, 26, cf. O. II 11, 15. III 14, 25). He was afterwards troubled with gout (Ep. I 20, 24. cf. 7, 10 sqq.) and hypochondriacal fits (Ep. I 8). A certain well-to-doness seems to be indicated by some expressions, e. g. on his library (S. I 6, 122. II 3, 11 sq. 6, 61. Ep. I 7, 12. 18, 108 sq.), his journeys (Ep. I 15, 1 sqq. cf. 7, 11 sq.), his slaves (S. I 6, 116. II 7, 118).

7. The question of the chronology of the poems of Horace was first dealt with by Masson, Jani templum Christo nascente reseratum (Rotterdam 1700) and vita Horatii (1708). Bentley dealt with it summarily, but pertinently, in the preface to his edition. See on this Masson, histoire critique de la république des lettres, Amsterdam 1714. V p. 148—203. C. Kirchner, Quaestiones horatianae (Naumburg 1834. 4.) p. 1—41. John Apitz, de aetate poematum horatianorum a R. Bentleio inventa, Berlin 1853. An original chronological arrangement

was adopted by Sanadon in his first edition, 1728. In recent time, Vanderbourg in his edition of the Odes (I p. 313 sqq, sur la publication des trois premiers livres des Odes; II 2 p. 556—563 sur la publication des Epodes, p. 625—631 ordre chronologique des Odes d'Horace). The opinions of G. F. Grotefend in his article an Horace (Ersch and Gruber's Encycl. II 10, 1853, p. 457—476; cf. also his treatise on the literary career of Horace, Hanover 1849) rest on better foundations. As the same time C. Kirchner l. l. gave a table of his system. A new disquisition by C. Franke, fasti horatiani, Berlin 1839, with an Epistola Lachmanni, p. 235—240. The whole question reviewed by W. Teuffel, Prolegomena to a Horatian Chronology, Ztschf. f. AW. 1842, p. 1103—1116; on the date of the Epodes, ibid. 1844, nr. 64—66, p. 508—525. 1845, nr. 75—77, p. 596—616; on the Satires, Rhein. Mus. IV (1845) p. 93—119. 208—241. W. Fürstenau, de carminum aliquot hor. chronologia, Hersfeld 1838. S. Cahn, trias quaestionum horat., Bonn 1838. B. Sökeland, on the chronology of Horace's poems, I. Coesfeld 1841. 4. W. Th. Streuber, Basle 1843. C. G. Zumpt's preface to Wüstemann's edition of the Satires p. 20—42 (cf. Rhein. Mus. IV p. 224 sqq.) On the dates of single poems we possess treatises by W. Fr. Wiedasch (Quaestiones chronologicae, Nordhausen 1847. 4., on O. I 2), Fr. Ueberweg (Philol. VI p. 306—323, on O. I 34), C. F. Sehrwald (de tribus Hor. carminibus, Altenburg 1858. 20 pp. 4.), Clodig (de ordine et temporibus quibus H. satiras composuit, Triest 1867. 4.). Ribbeck, Epistles p. 83—96. On some (supposed) relations between the poems of Horace and Virgil see H. Düntzer, in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 99 p. 313—330.

8. The traditional order of the works in the mss. is: 4 books of carmina, Epodes, Carmen saeculare, Satires, and Epistles. Only the so-called Ars poetica stands in the mss. sometimes after the Epodes and the carmen saec., sometimes between the Satires and Epistles, perhaps because this work being the last composed by Horace had not yet received a fixed place from him. The traditional order is based upon the principle of joining compositions in the same metre, according to the time in which each book was composed, only the odes occupying the first place, as the arranger seems to have considered them of principal importance. In each book we notice a certain endeavour to give due prominence in the arrangement to the poems addressed to the poet's most valued friends; as for the rest, we find that in the Epodes the poems in the same metre are put together, but in the Odes separated, as far as possible; at least two Sapphic Odes are never found together, though sometimes Alcaeic Odes, which are indeed more frequent. O. II 1—10 Alcaeic and Sapphic poems succeed each other in regular interchange. This arrangement was all the more practical, as the poems were originally separated from each other only by the difference in metre, not by headings. H. Stephanus, diatribe de titulis et ordine librorum Horatii, in his edition of Horace. S. Cahn, trias quaestionum hor. (Bonn 1838) p. 1—17. W. Teuffel, Ztschf. f. AW. 1842, p. 1108—1111. A. Herrmann, Curae horatianae, Celle 1861. 4.

Al. Riese, Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 93, p. 474—476. Ribbeck, Epistles, p. 82 sq.

230. Horace is a highly sensitive nature, in which intellect predominates. It would be idle to expect in him great flights of imagination, idealism of thought and feeling, inspiration, or even anything exciting inspiration. We find in him rare lucidity, calmness and sagacity of mind, a searching knowledge of his own self and of other persons and relations. His sense of independence disgusted him with the capital and endeared to him the quiet of country life. His political opinions and his conduct towards Augustus are a continual compromise between this feeling of independence and his perception of what was possible and what necessary under the circumstances. Here also he hit upon the difficult way of neither degrading himself nor offending others. He was not a member of the Opposition, but observed political decency. His views were those of a mature mind, which had got over the passions of youth and could face death intrepidly. Hence his tone changes from joyous love of the goods of human life to calm resignation of the enjoyments refused to us; he is fond of dwelling upon neutral words and soft tints. The aim constantly pursued by Horace is the quiet smoothness of mind not disturbed by the storms of passions or by exterior circumstances or by the proposals of other men. His intellect sharpened his taste and imparted to his style its peculiar lucidity which we miss only in those parts where he cannot render his own impressions. Nothing is more foreign to him than exaggeration and bombast. His knowledge of the limitation of human existence makes him talk of himself with good humour, and with irony of all who deem themselves great; but it is seen to best advantage in his vein of good-natured raillery.

1. Jani, de moribus Horatii prolusio (Halle 1774. 4. and in his edition I p. C—CIII). R. van Ommeren, On Horace as man and Roman citizen, from the Dutch by Walch, Leipzig 1802. Seiz, Horace's life and poems, Nuremberg 1815. W. Teuffel, the Character of Horace (Leipzig 1842), espec. p. 55 sqq.; on Horace (Tüb. 1868. 4) p. 34 sq. W. E. Weber, Q. Horatius Flaccus as man and poet, Jena 1844. Andaltshauser, on Horace and his poems, Straubing 1846. 4. Lysander, Comm. de Horatio homine ac poeta, Lund 1848. 4. S. Karsten, C. Hor. Fl., a sketch of his life, studies and poems, from the Dutch by M.

Schwach, Leipzig 1863. Fr. D. Gerlach, the life and poems of Horace, Basle 1867.

2. His relations to his friends. F. Jacobs, Miscellaneous Writings V p. 3 sqq. Knebel, on the character of Horace, especially concerning his friendship with Maecenas, Ztschf. f. AW. 1841. Nr. 93. Frandsen, Maecenas (1843) p. 183—220. C. G. Zumpt's preface to Wüstemann's edition of the Satires, p. 12—19. G. F. Grotefend, Horace's friends and acquaintances, Philol. II p. 280—288. H. Paldamus, Horace and Maecenas, Ztschf. f. AW. 1848. Nr. 113. Fr. Jacob, Horace and his friends, Berlin 1852 sq. 2 vols.

3. Concerning Horace's relations to Augustus, Suetonius relates some interesting particulars which show how greatly Augustus endeavoured to gain the poet in his favour, and how slow the latter was to conform to his wishes. The same appears from the poems which he kept back so very long in spite of the numerous personal relations no doubt caused by Horace's intimate intercourse with Maecenas, and again when he broke his silence, his communications merely contain facts, and steer clear of the writer's personal convictions. In those cases in which Horace could not possibly avoid urgent demands, external compulsion is easily felt in the tone of the poems in question. But he did not yield to these demands until the monarchy was firmly established, when it would have been scarcely wise to keep aloof much longer. Nor are there many nowadays who would upbraid Horace with this conduct. On the contrary, it has recently become the habit of some critics to trace deep and refined political calculations in the poems of Horace. It has e. g. been maintained that Horace recommended temperance and inambitious enjoyment of life especially to those men whose high descent, riches or pride might inspire Augustus with distrust (C. Peter, History of Rome III p. 110). But it seems intelligible enough that he should address them to such as might lend them a willing ear, though not the slightest trace seems to prove that he did so in furtherance of the interests of Augustus.

See Wieland's introduction to the second Epistle. Boost, on a charge brought against Horace, Frankfort 1807. F. Jacobs, Miscellaneous Writings V p. 318 sqq. E. Salverte, Horace et l'empereur Auguste. Paris 1823. Giesebrecht, quid de Horatio senserit Augustus, Prenzlau 1829. 4. Feldbausch, de Horatio non adulatore, Heidelberg 1839 (comp. W. Teuffel in Jahn's Jahrb. XXVIII p. 327 sqq.) Hempel, how far may Horace be considered the herald of monarchic principles? Bromberg 1840. 4. E. Weber, Horace as man (1844) p. 168 sqq. Werner, Quaestiones horatianae, Götti. 1847 (de Horatio Augusti laudatore). Paul, de Hor. in Augustum laudatione, Thorn 1847. 4. O. Jahn, Grenzboten 1868, p. 96 sq.

4. As to the morality of Horace it should be granted that only in his later and more mature poems his views as to sexual intercourse rise above those of his period. But not all passages in the Odes

touching this point should be understood literally. See in general Lessing, Vindication of Horace (Works IV p. 215 sqq. edition of 1867. VIII p. 1—40). Les amours d'Horace, Cologne 1728. W. Teuffel, de Horatii amoribus, Jahn's Archiv VI (1840) p. 325—374. VII p. 648—650; on the character of Horace (1842) p. 85—89. Düntzer, on the criticism and explanation of Horace III p. 35—42. W. E. Weber in Jahn's Archiv IX p. 248—273.

5. We may speak of the philosophy of Horace in so far as we mean his general views of the world and as Horace assumed a certain position to the two principal systems then current at Rome, the Epicurean and Stoic philosophy. At first a decided follower of Epicurus (S. I 5, 101 sqq. Ep. I 4, 16) and adversary of Stoicism, Horace betrayed even then a certain interest in the latter system by his repeated recurrence to it (see W. Teuffel on Sat. II 7 p. 175 sq.). In spite of his epicurean views of life Horace had a philosophical bent and gradually came to esteem the moral earnest of the Stoic system independently of its strange excrescences; he gradually ceases to combat it and adopts some of its peculiarities (cf. Ep. I 1, 17), though he never really became a convert, but rather maintained towards the various systems the eclectic position of a dilettante (Ep. I 1, 14). O. I 34 is rather the expression of a transient frame of mind than the result of a thorough change of mind. The conversion supposed to have taken place then does not prevent the poet calling himself Epicuri de grege porcum (Ep. I 4, 16) even later. But O. II 2, 19 sqq. proves that when he was turned forty, (c. a. 730) he began to render more justice to the Stoic system. Treatises de philosophia Horatii or horatiana by J. Berger (Viteberg. 1704. 4.), Forelius Henning (Upsala 1706), Isr. Noraeus (Upsala 1706. 4.), Briegleb (Coburg 1777. 4.); de poenitentia Horatii philosophica (O. I 34) by Benner (Giessen 1734. 4.) and List (Giessen 1785.) Pflugradt (praeside J. E. J. Walch), de philosophia Horatii stoica, Jena 1764. 4. J. H. B. Fortlage, de praeceptis Hor. ad artem beate vivendi spectantibus, Osnabrück 1835. 4. Werner, de Horatio philosopho (Quaest. hor.), Göttingen 1847. Munding, the moral and religious views of Horace, Rottweil 1853. 4. J. Grautegein, de Horatii ratione theologica et philosophica, Münster 1857. A. Arnold, the Life of Horace and his philosophical, moral, and poetical character, Halle 1860. Th. Vogel, the wisdom of Horace, Meissen 1868.

231. The branch of poetry first cultivated by Horace was Satire. Following in the wake of Lucilius, Horace employed Satire to display his own individuality and his own views on various subjects. But after the horrible events of the preceding years, it was not possible to touch upon political topics without tearing up old wounds, and a writer that had been a partisan of the conquered side, could scarcely do better than be silent on politics, in order not to hurt his

character. Hence the subjects of Horace and the aims of his criticism are exclusively social and literary. The satirist rests his satire on an ethic basis, and endeavours to gain proselytes for his ethic ideal by impugning those who disfigure it; but this he does with the arms of jest, in treating perverse and objectionable things as merely ridiculous. The method of discussion is disguised by an appearance of laxity, though it is anything but planless. Most of the Satires of the second book are dressed up as dialogues and show a greater maturity of judgment than those of the first. As regards his form, Horace voluntarily confined himself to epic metre, this being indeed most in harmony with the general didactic character of his Satires, and also recommended by the example of Lucilius. In his verse Horace has succeeded in combining artistic correctness with ease and elegance.

1. Under the name of Sermones ('talk'), Horace himself includes both his Satires (S. I 4, 42. Ep. I 4, 1) and Epistles (Ep. II 1, 4. 250), both being in the manner of sermo, i. e. the language of every-day life and differing from it only by their metre (S. I 4, 56 sqq. cf. Musa pedestris, S. II 6, 17. Ep. II 3, 95). But as the Epistles are also Sermones, it becomes more advisable to designate the Satires as Satirae, especially as S. II 1, 1. 6, 17 show that this appellation is more in conformity with the poet's intention and characterizes in a better manner the position these poems occupy in literature and their relation to the predecessors and successors of Horace in this department of poetry.

2. Editions of all the Satires (independently of the complete editions of the works): translated, with notes and introductions by C. M. Wieland, Leipzig 1786. 2 parts. Fourth edition 1819. Explained by L. F. Heindorf, Breslau 1815, re-edited by E. F. Wüstemann, Leipzig 1843; third edition, corrected and revised by L. Döderlein, Leipzig 1859. Critically revised, translated, and explained by C. Kirchner, I (Stralsund 1829. 4). Translated and explained by W. E. Weber, edited by W. S. Teuffel, Stuttgart 1852. Satires and Epistles, explained by G. T. A. Krüger, Leipzig (Teubner), sixth edition 1869. Critically revised after thirty mss., metrically translated, and explained by C. Kirchner. I Text, translation, and critical apparatus. Leipzig 1854. II 1: Notes on the first book of the Satires (Leipzig 1855.) II 2: Notes on the second book of the Satires, by W. S. Teuffel (Leipzig 1857). Latin text and German translation by L. Döderlein, Leipzig 1860. Recensuit P. Hofmann Peerlkamp, Amstelod. 1863. Satires and Epistles, translated into German, with notes and introductions by E. Munk, Berlin 1867. Rec. A. Holder, Lips. 1869.

3. Among the commentations on single Satires (cf. W. Teuffel, on Horace, 1868, p. 11) we may especially mention. I 1 (by F. A. Wolf) Berlin 1813. 4. K. Reisig's Lectures on Sat. I 1 edited by Eberhard, Coburg 1840. 4. See also W. Teuffel in Jahn's Jahrb. XXXII p. 343—363. F. A. Eckstein, familiaris interpretatio, Lips. 1865. 4. — I 3 and 4 by C. Passow, Berlin 1827. 1828. 4. John Apitz, Coniectanea in Hor. Satiras, cum var. lectt. cod. ms. Berolinensis, Berlin 1856. C. Nipperdey, de locis quibusdam Hor. ex I Satt. commentatio I. II. Jena 1858. 4. T. Mommsen, Remarks on Horace's first satire, Frankfort 1871. 30 pp. 4.

4. Dan. Heinsius, de sat. horatiana libri II. Lugd. Bat. 1612. 8. Haberland, de iusto pretio satiris horat. statuendo, Lips. 1774. 4. Manso in the Additions to Sulzer IV p. 446 sqq. Niebuhr, Letter to a Philologer, edited by Jacob, p. 135—138. W. Teuffel, on the character of Horace (1842) p. 47—50. H. Berning, de satirica poesi Hor. collata cum Iuvenali, Recklingshausen 1843. 4. F. A. Beck, on the characteristic features of Horatian satire, Giessen 1859. 4. C. J. Bolia, de Hor. et Iuv. satt. auctoribus, Freiburg 1861. Grothof, Horace as a satirist, Heiligenstadt 1863. 4. E. Szelinski, de nominibus personarum, . . apud poetas satiricos rom. (Königsberg 1862) p. 10—42. Th. Fritzsche, Menippus and Horace, Güstrow 1871. 30 pp.

232. The Epodes which were written about the same time as the Satires are, like these, of an aggressive character and thus share with them a characteristic attribute of the author's youth; they are, however, directed against certain individuals, while the Satires contain criticisms on general circumstances. On the other hand, their melic form is, so to say, a prelude to the later lyrical poems of Horace. He appears here as an imitator of Archilochus, though with considerable independence. Besides the acerbity and animosity which form a characteristic feature of this kind of poetry, Horace imitated also its peculiar *αἰσχρολογία*. The later pieces of this collection are more quiet and mature and approach the style of the carmina, just as many of those might well be ranged among the Epodes according to form and contents. The Epodes are not divided into stanzas of four lines each, nor is it possible to trace any antistrophic composition in them.

1. The name of *ἐπῳδοί* and *τὰ ἐπῳδά*, epodon liber, is probably the addition of the grammarians, taken from the metrical character of most of the pieces. The name of epode became subsequently usual for all those kinds of metre (except elegiac distichs) in which a long and short line (the latter called *ὁ ἐπῳδός* sc. *στίχος*) are combined, especially an iambic trimeter and dimeter, e. g. Epo. 1—10. Thus e. g.

Schol. Hermog. in Walz's Rhetores graeci VII p. 820: ἐστὶ δὲ ἀεὶ τὸ ἐπῳδὸν βραχύτερον τοῦ πρὸ αὐτοῦ στίχου συλλαβὰς τέτταρας. Porphyrio on Epo. 1. Horace himself (Epo. 14, 7. Od. I 16, 3. 24. Epi. I 19, 23. II 2, 59) justly calls these poems iambi, whence also Epo. 17 is entitled to form part of this collection. For the relation of these poems to Archilochus see Epi. I 19, 23—25. On the intimate connexion of the latest Epodes with the earliest Odes see Epo. 9 and O. I 37. A similar spirit to the Epodes appears also in O. III 15; in fact, O. I 4. 7. 28. II 18. IV 7 might as well form part of the Epodes, as far as their metrical form goes — but that collection was already completed when the Odes were composed.

2. Blühdorn, de natura epodorum H., Brandenburg 1795. 4. Ph. Buttmann, Mythologus I p. 318 sq. Vanderbourg's edition II 2. p. 549—563. Franke, fasti hor. p. 43—50. W. Fürstenau, de carm. hor. chronologia p. 11—16. W. Teuffel, Ztschf. f. AW. 1844 sq. (see above 229, 1). M. Axt, On the criticism and explanation of the Epodes of Horace, Creuznach 1846. 4. Leidloff, de epodon Hor. aetate, Holzminden 1856. F. Martin, de Her. epodorum ratione antistrophica et interpolationibus, Posen 1860. 4. On the other hand see A. Buttmann in Mützell's Ztschf. f. Gymn. 1862, p. 673—704. 753—780.

233. When Horace was already midway between thirty and forty, he resolved to use the formal polish he had acquired in composing his Epodes for the purpose of transplanting Alcaeus and Sappho into Roman soil. He did so for at least seven years, and the result is the three first books of the carmina, to which he subsequently added a fourth after an interval of about six years. Being the production of the ripest years of Horace, his lyric poems display his peculiarities most undisguisedly and are, moreover, in point of form the most polished of his creations. It should, however, also be observed that they are not an outpouring of inspiration and overflowing imagination, but chiefly indicate a clear, quiet, and mature mind, a bent for clear observation of mankind and reflection on the important questions of life, as well as artistic moderation, especially in the thoughtful lucidity of their conception, the evenness of their execution (in which a certain fondness of trichotomic composition is easily perceptible), the severe regularity, beauty, and harmony of their metres; and their polished language. There are not, however, wanting indications of tameness and frigidity; some turns and expressions are rather prosaic; we meet with exaggerations quite at variance with the poet's general good taste, nay even with repetitions in the whole collection, but especially

frequent in the fourth book. These faults appear most of all in those poems which were not inspired by the poet's own passion, but are either mere conceptions or even written at order; but when Horace's heart was interested, he often rose to real beauty. He began his lyric poetry with imitations of Greek works, gradually attempted independent composition in their spirit, and last of all treated original subjects, chosen from contemporary history, or manifestations of his own mind, in the forms of the Greeks.

1. Personal criticism of Horace: operosa parvus carmina fingo, O. IV 2, 31 sq. Epo. 11 and 14 he confesses that love prevented him from working (writing). O. I 1, 19 sqq. 29 sqq. harmless enjoyment of life is contrasted with poetical studies. Even S. I 4, 39 sqq. Horace exempts himself from the number of real poets, though in other places he speaks complacently of his lyrical performances (especially in the last poems of the second and third books of the Odes): but the great care and industry bestowed upon his compositions gave him a subjective, and the renown he gained by them, an objective right to do so.

2. Horace repeatedly calls his poems aeolium or lesbium carmen, e. g. O. III 30, 13. IV 3, 12. I 26, 11. 32, 4 sq., cf. IV 6, 35. Their connexion with subjective Aeolic melic poetry is indeed their chief characteristic, and it is the chief merit of Horace that he left aside the choric lyrics of the Dorians as unfit for transplanting into a foreign soil on account of their musical and orchestic and ritual character, and did not commit the mistake of most Romans in choosing the erudite Alexandrine poets for his models, but rather fell back upon the genuine classical melic poets of the Greeks (who were at the same time of far greater interest to general readers), such as Alcaeus, Sappho, and Anacreon — an immense gain in naturalness. Yet he did not do so throughout and consistently, but instead of nature he often started with artificial and rhetorical motives, or even followed certain tendencies. A. Kiessling, on the reception of the Odes of Horace in the first century, in the Transactions of the Philological Congress at Kiel (Leipzig 1870) p. 28—37, misjudges the whole question. As translations we may safely consider I 9 and 18, as well as the beginning of I 37. In all these instances we may see how far Horace was from the fresh native energy of his originals, but also how clearly he knew what he had to omit or change and what to adopt, how well he managed his transitions and connexions, and how he brings his poem within the immediate scope of his reader by adding concrete traits of contemporary history. But independently of the intentional imitations we meet also with frequent reminiscences of Greek poets, which however we should not imagine to have been collected with bee-like industry. On Horace's relation to the Greeks see H. Wagner, Hor. carmina collatione scriptorum graecorum illustrata,

Halle 1770. Additamenta to this 1771. Wensch, de Hor. Graecos imitandi studio ac ratione, Viteb. 1829. 4. Rotter, de Horatii studiis graecis, Gleiwitz 1836. 4. G. F. Grotefend, on the originality of Hor. in his Odes, Ztschr. f. AW. 1844, Nr. 19. Th. Arnold, quaestionis de Horatio Graecorum imitatore particula, Halle 1845; on the Greek studies of Hor., Halle 1855. 1856. 4. Göbel, Horace and Euripides, Mützell's Ztschr. f. Gymn. I. 1851. p. 298—323. H. H. Garcke, Hor. carm. libri I collatis scriptoribus graecis illustrati specimen, Halle 1853. 1860. 4.; Quaestionum de graecismo Hor. pars prior, Halle 1860. 240 pp. 8. Attempts at a Greek translation of some of Horace's Odes by B. Arnold, München 1858. 4.

3. A clear preception of his task and the means available to him is also indicated in Horace's manner of treating the Greek metres, especially the Sapphic and Alcaeic metre, in which he shows an increase of consistence. In the first place in just consideration of the grave character of the Latin language which abounds in spondees, he adopted spondees in all places where a trochee or iamb might be replaced by them. Only I 15 proves to be one of the very earliest attempts of this kind, as Horace does not seem to have carried out his law v. 24 and 36; another exception is III 3, 17. In the same way, in the anacrusis of the Alcaeic line Horace has admitted a short syllable five times in the first book, three times in the second, twice in the third, while he avoids it in the fourth. Secondly Horace has adopted caesura from epic poetry, as he knew beforehand that his melic poetry would not be sung, but only recited or read; see above 34, 4. A careful study of Horace's treatment of caesura will also show that he steadily laboured at the perfection of the outward form of his poetry. In his Alcaeic strophes Horace formed the second part (the third line in nine syllables) in the Odes of the two first books so as to give it, like the first part (the first two lines of the strophe) and like his own Sapphic line, the caesura *πενθημιμερής* (i. e. division of 5 + 4). But subsequently he came to the conclusion that this rendered the line monotonous (the general defect of the Horatian metres), hence he carefully avoided this caesura of the third line and replaced it by others (especially the division of 6 + 3, sometimes also 7 + 2, with separate division of the first part). This division is carried out much too consistently to be mere chance. See C. Lachmann's note to Franke's fasti hor. p. 238—240. On the metres of the odes of Horace see the introductions to most of the editions, also W. Teuffel's preface to G. Ludwig's new translation of the Odes (Stuttgart 1860) p. 24 sqq. = Stuttgarter Correspondenzblatt 1860, nr. 3. A. Schnitz (Cologne 1831. 4). G. Pinzger (Liegnitz 1833), Richter (de Hor. metris lyricis I. Recklingshausen 1863. 4.), H. Schiller (for school-use, Leipzig, Teubner 1869). On his use of elisions see K. Lehrs, Horatius p. I—XXII. Lindemann, de hiatu in versibus Hor. lyricis, Zittau 1825. 4. Cadenbach, de alliterationis apud Hor. usu, Essen 1838. 4. W. Christ, on the metrical art of Horace when judged according to ancient tradition, Trans. of the Sessions of the Academy at Munich 1868, p. 1 sqq.

4. Strophic arrangement is peculiar to the idea of an ancient μέλος. Hence we meet with it in the odes of Horace. Yet not only in Pindarus, but also in Alcaeus and Sappho we often see sense and grammatical construction carried beyond the limits of the strophes (Westphal, on Greek metres II² p. 295), so that there is nothing strange in Horace taking the same liberty, much more as he had less to care about the musical recitation of his odes (see n. 3). The smallest compass of a strophe embraces two lines, like the elegiac distich. The epodes of Archilochus and Horace keep within this. But the Sapphic and Alcaeic strophes consist of four lines each, likewise those forms of the Asclepiadean metre in which three Asclepiadean lines are joined to a Glyconean, or two Asclepiadean lines and one Glyconean are joined to a Pherecratean. If an Asclepiadean is joined to a Glyconean line, the result is a strophe of two lines; if the asclepiadeus minor or maior is simply repeated through the whole poem, we have an apparently monostichic composition. But after the example of Wetzel, C. Lachmann (Ztsch. f. AW. 1845, p. 461) and A. Meineke, in the preface of his edition, have made the observation that not only with the latter metres, but also in all poems resembling epodes, in fact in all the poems of the four books (except IV 8), the number of the lines is divisible by four, from which they concluded that Horace himself probably considered his poems as strophes of four lines each. On the influence of this discovery on the criticism of Horace see L. Döderlein, Public Speeches (1860) p. 388 sqq. 403 sq. Comp. Weyhe, Observations on the structure and character of the strophes of Horace, Halberstadt 1870. 12 pp. 4. The sole exception to this rule is O. IV 8 which consists of 34 lines and is not, therefore, divisible by four. Hence either a gap of two lines, or an interpolation of two (or 6, or 10, or 14, or 18) lines has been assumed. But as this form (the asclepiadeus maior simply repeated) occurs only this once in the fourth book, the possibility remains that after the publication of three books of odes Horace arrived at the conclusion that this strict adoption of divisibility by four in stichic poems was not only superfluous, but even monotonous, and purposely violated his law in his fourth book. This is the more probable as Horace follows other principles in several other particulars in the fourth book, e. g. especially in the Sapphic Odes he treated the caesura κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον as equally legitimate with the πενθημιμερής, he saw that it was unpleasant for recitation to add the Adonius immediately to the third line. Last of all, Horace has always avoided the synaloephe of a long vowel in his fourth book (Lachmann on Lucr. p. 219).

5. Ovid Trist. IV 10, 49 sq.: tenuit nostras numerosus Horatius aures, dum ferit ausonia carmina culta lyra. Petron. Sat. 118: Horatii curiosa felicitas. Quintilian I. O. X 1, 96: lyricorum (rom.) Horatius fere solus legi dignus. nam et insurgit aliquando et plenus est iucunditatis et gratiae et variis figuris et verbis felicissime audax. Paneg. in Pis. 229 sq. Apoll. Sidon. ep. VIII 11. carm. IX 218—222. Jani before his edi-

tion I p. CIV—CIX. Manso in his Additions to Sulzer V p. 301—322. R. Hanow, is Horace a small poet? Halle 1838. 4. Ad. Stahr, in the Hall. Jahrb. 1840, p. 1652 sqq. W. Teuffel, ibid. 1841, nr. 106—112, and Characteristics of Horace (Leipzig 1842), p. 13 sqq. 73—85. A. G. Gernhard, de compositione carminum Hor. explananda I. Weimar 1841. II. 1842. 4. M. Fleischer, meditationum ad Hor. poesin lyricam pertinentium part. I. Cleve 1843. 4. Hagelüken, de Hor. carminum elegantia, Münstereifel 1851. 4. A. Rothmaler, de Horatio verborum inventore, Berlin 1862. C. Zangemeister, de Horatii verbis singularibus, Berlin 1862. E. L. Trompheller, A Contribution to the proper estimation of Horace's poetical composition, I. Coburg 1855. II. Coburg 1858. 4. C. Prien, the symmetrical structure of the Odes of Horace, Rhein. Mus. XIII p. 321—376. Kirchhoff, the melic law of composition in Horace, Mützell's Ztschr. XII p. 717—740. 1860, p. 81—106. F. Martin, de aliquot Hor. carminum ratione antistrophica et interpolationibus, Posen 1865. 4. Here, as well as in the epodes, Martin simply goes upon the plan of eliminating all passages which are at variance with his assumed laws of symmetry; so also C. Prien, F. J. Schwerdt, and others. Such mechanical views of the whole composition of Horace have been caused by the methodical arrangement of some of his lyric poems.

6. Horace's predilection for the number of three in the illustrations given by him is very conspicuous, just as also he frequently repeats himself: W. Teuffel, on Horace (1868) p. 18 sq. Prosaic illustrations and turns occur e. g. III 1, 25. 34 sqq. 4, 69 sq. 5, 12. 11, 18 sq. IV 4, 37 sq. Prosaic particles like ergo (Epo. 2, 9), quodsi (I 1, 35. III 1, 41. Epo. 2, 39. 10, 21. 11, 15. 14, 13), atqui (I 23, 9. III 5, 49. 7, 9), quatenus (III 24, 30), eius atque (III 11, 18 cf. IV 8, 18), also namque (I 22, 9. 34, 5. IV 1, 13). An elevated tone does not suit Horace, and whenever he hits upon it, he soon gets out of it again, though sometimes one may doubt whether he does so with intentional humour, e. g. when he says of Venus IV 1, 21 sq.: naribus duces tura, or II 20, 9 sqq. It sounds like parody to read in a Sapphic ode of teretes surae (II 4, 21) or in an Alcaeic ode of olentis uxores mariti (I 17, 7). Frequently, however, such instances of bad taste arise from Roman rudeness and are traces of the "fearful realism" (to use Göthe's expression) of Horace. Bad taste of this kind appears in auritae quercus (I 12, 11 sq.), the libido quae solet matres furiare equorum (I 25, 13 sq.), clavi trabales etc. (I 35, 18 sqq.), hydrops and aquosus languor (II 2, 13 sqq.) and in the massive expressions II 5, 2 sqq. 11, 21. III 11, 19. IV 13. Epo. 9, 35. In the same way vitrea Circe (I 17, 20) and purpurei olores (IV 1, 10) are not exactly elegant epithets. See O. Keller, Rh. Mus. XIX p. 211—213. — It also happens frequently that Horace cannot satisfy himself in illustrations, but like an insatiate rhetorician heaps instance upon instance: cf. I 1. III 1, 9 sqq. 41 sqq. 27, 1—16. Epo. 1. Neither II 20 nor III 30 can be called moderate. Learning is put in quite out of its proper place II 17, 13—20. 18, 35 sqq. Exception may be most frequently taken to the long odes, as Horace's

inadequate talents for lyric poetry become most conspicuous. But Gruppe's dictum (Minos p. 412) 'Horace appears as such only in his odes' and Lehrs's paradoxical opinion (New Swiss Museum 1861, p. 64) 'The real Horace is never found in his Odes' are equally wrong; on the contrary, the same individuality as is seen in the Satires and Epistles appears to all intents and purposes also in the Odes; whence we should also explain the good and bad qualities of the latter. An impartial criticism on Horace's lyrics by G. Bernhardy, Berlin Jahrb. 1835, p. 750. Lehrs, Hor. p. LXXV, justly says 'we should learn not to exaggerate the poetical character of Horace and even be prepared to meet with great defects'. But he does not act up to this maxim; see n. 7.

7. The general opinion of our time agrees with the unsophisticated admirers of Horace in former times in assuming Horace to have been a perfect poet to whom no blame could possibly attach. As this gratuitous assumption is, however, contradicted by the facts themselves, the consequence is — not that this assumption is given up as utterly void of foundation, — but rather that everything contradictory to it is pronounced spurious. It is true that even after the most extensive omissions much remains which might justify renewed objections, and consequently new omissions, so that we should never have done with them. Though this view is apparently illogical, it is still (curiously enough) considered the acme of wisdom by many, and even excellent scholars do not scruple to cut and omit whole passages, whenever they meet in Horace's poems with some imperfection or other. This way of holding interpolators responsible has caused the other consequence of unjust criticisms on the poems themselves, in which even such passages as deserved no blame at all were treated superciliously. The first who applied this idea of the absolute perfection of the poems of Horace to their criticism and even made it the test of their genuine or spurious origin, was the Dutch scholar P. Hofman Peerlkamp in his Edition of the Odes of 1834. See G. Bernhardy, Berl. Jahrb. 1835, May, nr. 91—93, p. 737—756. W. Teuffel, on Peerlkamp and his opponents, Jahn's Jahrb. 41, p. 438—453, and in the Annals of our time, 1843, nr. 50—52 = Stuttg. Correspondenzblatt 1859, nr. 9, p. 196—213; see also On Horace (Tübingen 1868. 4.) p. 20—22. L. Müller, in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 87 p. 171 sq. 176—184. J. W. Graser, de Peerlkampi in Hor. carminibus criticam factitandi ratione, Magdeburg 1868. 4. F. Martin (de aliquot Hor. carminibus comm. critica, Posen 1844. 4.), A. Meineke, S. Dyckhoff (de aliquot Hor. carminum locis suspectis, Münster 1857), C. Prien, G. Linker (in his edition 1856 and in the Transactions of the Breslau Congress, Breslau 1858. 4. p. 100—109), N. W. Ljungberg (Jahn's Jahrb. 80 p. 440—470), O. F. Gruppe (Minos, on the interpolated passages in the Roman poets etc. Leipzig 1859), and K. Lehrs (Horace, 1869, p. XXVI—CXXXVIII) followed in the wake of Peerlkamp. See also K. Gesell, de interpolationibus mythologicis apud Hor., Bonn 1865. A kind of intermediate pro-

ceeding of assuming only a moderate number of interpolations is adopted by L. Müller, and by S. Heynemann, de interpolationibus in carm. Hor. certa ratione diiudicandis, Bonn 1871. 27 pp.

8. Modern separate editions of the Odes and Epodes especially by Ch. D. Jani (2 vols., Lips. 1778—82. Ed. II. ib. 1809), Ch. W. Mitscherlich (2 vols. Lips. 1800), C. F. Preiss (Leipzig 1805—1807. 4 vols.), Ch. Vanderbourg (ad fidem XVIII mss. Paris. rec. etc. 2 vols. Paris 1812), P. Hofman-Peerlkamp (Harlem 1834. Ed. altera emendata et aucta, Amsterdam 1862. See above n. 7), F. Lübker (Notes on book I—III, Schleswig 1841), Th. Obbarius (critically emended, explained etc. Jena 1848; for school-use, edited by L. S. Obbarius, Jena 1856), C. I. Grysar (with an introduction in CXXXIV pp., Vienna 1853), C. W. Nauck (for school-use, Leipzig 1853. 1856. 1860. 1863. 1865), O. Keller (recensuit, Lips. 1864. See O. Keller, Rhein. Mus. XVIII. p. 271—285. XIX p. 211—227).

9. The treatises on isolated odes are exceedingly numerous: see W. Teuffel, on Horace (1868) p. 23 sq. We may mention: I 1 by G. Hermann (Lips. 1842. 4.), Chr. Jahn (Lips. 1845. 4. cf. Jahn's Jahrb. 43, p. 462—466). I 28 by C. Prantl (München 1842), L. Döderlein (Trans. of the Erlangen Congress, Erl. 1852. 4., p. 51—58 cf. 59 sq.) C. Göttling (Jena 1854. 4. = Collected Essays II p. 214—233), J. A. Mähly (Rhein. Mus. N. S. X p. 127—136), F. Martin (Posen 1858. 4.), H. J. Heller (Philologus XVI p. 731—736). I 20. 30. II 11. IV 3 in F. A. Eckstein's scholae Horatianae (Lips. 1869. 4.) p. 1—41. 50. II 1 by F. Ritschl (Rhein. Mus. XI. p. 628—636 cf. XII p. 457 sqq. 630), F. Martin (Posen 1858. 4.). III 3 by C. L. Struve (Opusc. sel. II p. 369 — 409), C. Kiesel (Düsseldorf 1845. 4.), Bamberger (Opusc. p. 200—211), R. Rauchenstein (New Swiss Museum I. 1861. p. 129—142), H. Schwalbe (Eisleben 1863. 4.). III 27 by Th. Schäfer (Lips. Teubner 1868). Carmen saeculare by C. F. Hermann (de loco Apollinis in C. s., Gotting. 1843. 4.).

[English Translations of the Odes by Th. Martin and Conington; these two at least deserve mention, though there is no year without its crop of translations from Horace.]

10. We also possess melodies to some of the Odes, which prove that Horace was occasionally sung in the monasteries; see Orelli-Baiter's edition II p. 915 sqq. Kirchner, Novae quaest. Hor. p. 37.

234. The Epistles are written in the same metre as the Satires and share with them the general character of sermones; but being the production of maturer age, the Epistles are not meant to influence the whole period by criticizing individuals and bear, both in tone and form, the stamp of greater calmness, seriousness and self-conscious power. Now describing the character of the author, now absorbed in

the immediate purpose of a letter, now dealing with a given subject in quite a didactic style, they excel in the nice tact with which difficult questions concerning personal or social relations are treated of, and abound in excellent matter. The latter may especially be applied to the three letters of the second book, in which Horace's literary views are defended with much warmth and in some passages with partiality, maintaining that the Romans ought to fall back upon the genuine Greek models and endeavour after their formal polish rather than imitate the neglect and disregard of form peculiar to the old Roman poets. The third of these epistles is the most famous, addressed to the brothers Piso, and in which a number of aesthetic questions are dealt with in a very sensible manner, in the style of Greek models, but with considerable originality.

1. As sermones (i. e. in antithesis to compositions in an elevated style) the Epistles are mentioned Ep. II 1, 250, though this is not meant to go against their title, which is constantly given as Epistulae by the grammarians and mss. See a scholion at the beginning of the Satires: Sermonum libri ideo dicti quia vili sermone potius quam tumenti sive quia ad praesentes scribuntur. epistulis enim ad absentes loquimur, sermone cum praesentibus. quamvis igitur hoc opus Satiram esse Horatius ipse profiteatur (Ep. II 1, 1), tamen proprios titulos voluit ei adcommodari, hos priores libros duos Sermonum, posteriores Epistularum inscribens. More mature art appears in the Epistles even in details. Jeep (de elisionibus Horatianis, Wolfenbüttel 1844. 4.) has calculated that in the 2113 lines of the Satires there are more than 900 elisions, but in the 1968 lines of the Epistles only about 500, and in case the first vowel is long, we have no elision, at least in Ep. II 3 (M. Haupt, Observ. crit. p. 18 vgl. ib. p. 48. Lachmann on Lucretius p. 77).

2. Separate editions of the Epistles. Explained by Fr. E. Th Schmid, Halberstadt 1828. 1830. 2 vols. (without Ars poet.) For Colleges by Fr. v. P. Hocheder, Regensburg 1831. 2 vols. Commentariis uberrimis instructas ed. S. Obbarius, Lips. 1837—1847. 2 vols. (without book II). Satires by G. T. A. Krüger, Leipzig 1853. 1856. 1860. 1866. 1869. With an introduction and critical notes by O. Ribbeck, Berlin 1869. Latin and German by J. S. Strodtmann (Leipzig 1854), L. Döderlein (Leipzig 1856. 1858. 2 vols.), F. S. Feldbausch (Leipzig 1860. 2 numbers; the translation in prose).

3. C. Morgenstern, de sat. et epist. hor. discrimine, Lips. 1801. 4. C. Passow (see n. 2) p. CXXXIX sqq. note 178. 180. 282. A. G. Rein, de Persii satiris et Horatii epistolis, Gera 1839. 4. W. Teuffel, Characteristic of Hor. (1842) p. 61—64. Düntzer, on criticism and expla-

nation III p. 73—85. W. E. Weber, Horatius (1944), p. 281—298. Schierenberg, on the persons of the Epistles of Horace, Detmold 1846. 4. Estienne, étude morale et littéraire sur les Epitres d'Horace, Paris 1851. Manso, on Horace's criticism on the earlier Roman poets, in his Miscellaneous Essays (Breslau 1821) p. 87—106. K. Reichel, Horace and early Roman poetry, Pressburg 1852. 4. E. Meissner, Horace's struggles for the improvement of poetical taste, Dresden 1867. Berning, on the tendency of the Epistles of Horace, Recklingshausen 1856. 4. H. Keck, de Hor. Epist. libro I critica ad L. Doederleinum epistola, Kiel 1857. 4. H. Muther, Contributions towards the explanation and emendation of the Epistles of Horace, Coburg 1864. 4. K. Lehrs, Horatius (1869) p. CLVII—CCXXI. W. H. Kolster, on the Epistles of Horace which may be shown to be answers to preceding letters, Meldorf 1867. 4. F. Pahle, on the explanation of epp. I, in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 97, p. 185—206. 269—294.

4. Treatises on isolated letters, e. g. I 11 and 14 by C. Campe (Philol. XXIX p. 448—468); I 12 by J. Arnoldt (Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 101 p. 619—647); I 1 by M. Schanz in the Trans. of the Würzburg Congress (Leipzig 1869) p. 115—119. Courtry, Revue de l'instr. publ. en Belgique XI 4 sq. Ep. II 1 by K. Zell (Heidelberg 1819), H. Riedel (Groning. 1831), cf. J. Vahlen (Ztsch. f. östr. Gymn. XXII. 1871. p. 1—25, and against Ribbeck ibid. p. 241—253. 254—260.). K. Lehrs, Supplement to Horace, Leipzig 1871. 16 pp.

5. Ep. II 3 is already quoted by Quintilian VIII 3, 60 as Ars poetica (Horatius in prima parte libri de arte poetica); cf. Symm. Ep. I 4. Apoll. Sid. carm. 22 (lyricus Flaccus in Artis poeticae volumine), and IX 220. Priscian XVIII 101. p. 1149 P. = II p. 254, 16 Htz.: Horatius de arte poetica). This title is not, however, given by Horace himself, who was quite satisfied with addressing it to the Pisones. It appears from the allusions to historical events (see W. Teuffel's translation, Stuttg. 1859, p. 304 sq.) that this is one of the latest, if not the latest, composition by Horace, a conclusion also borne out by its form (above n. 1) and its varying position in the mss. (above 229, 8.). — Porphyrion at the commencement (II p. 649 Hauthal): hunc librum, qui inscribitur de arte poetica, ad L. Pisonem . . eiusque filios misit. . . in quem librum congessit praecepta Neoptolemi *τοῦ Παριανοῦ* de arte poetica, non quidem omnia, sed eminentissima. This distinct information by Porphyrio obliges us not to follow Meineke in thinking of the work of that Alexandrine writer *περὶ ἀστεϊσμῶν*, though again it does not compel us to believe that Horace availed himself of such an inferior source on a subject of which he was complete master. But Aristotle's treatise on poetry could be neither ignored nor overlooked by Horace; a parallelism between Aristotle's and Horace's opinions, though partly exaggerated, is given by Streuber p. 72—77.

6. Editions of the Ars poetica e. g. by Fr. v. P. Hocheder (Passau 1824), P. Hofmann Peerlkamp (Leidae 1845).

7. Treatises on the explanation of the Ars poetica. Van Reenen, dissertat. philol.-crit. etc., Amst. 1806. 4. Eichstädt, quo tempore et ad quos scripta sit, Jenae 1811. fol. Bosch, curae secundae in Hor. Epist. ad Pis. Jenae 1812. fol. cf. Ernesti Parerga p. LI—LXXI. Dohrn, some observations on A. p., Itzehoe 1824. 4. Mittermayer, Progr. Aschaffenburg 1827. 4. Lidberg, Lund 1833. Ed. Müller, A history of art among the ancients, II p. 269—284. Lilie, Breslau 1839. W. Th. Streuber, Basle 1839. Lindemann, Part. I and II. Zittau 1841. 4. J. Hilgers, Bonn 1841. Fr. Jacob, on the relation of the Epistles of Horace to his Satires, Lübeck 1841, p. 7—15. W. Teuffel, on the character of Horace (1842) p. 64—73. J. Eckert, Illustrations etc., Landshut 1843. 4. G. Bernhardy, prooemium de Hor. Ep. ad Pisones, Halle 1847. 4. J. Fr. Fischeri dictata in Hor. A. p., ed. L. S. Obbarius, Rudolstadt 1848. 1850. 4. Hantschke, de sententiarum ordine in Hor. Ep. ad P., Wetzlar 1853. 4. J. Piechowski, de Ep. ad P., Moscow 1853. J. Freudenmann, on the cause and purpose of the A. p., Ehingen 1854. 4. G. C. Mezger, Expositio Ep. ad P., Augsburg 1855. 4. J. M. E. Feys, l'art poétique d'H. considérée dans son ordonnance, Brussels 1856. A. Michaelis, de auctoribus quos Horatius in libro de arte poetica secutus esse videatur, Kiel 1857. 4. Rührmund, in Mützell's Ztschr. f. Gymn. 1858, p. 250—260. B. Büchsenschütz, Philologus XII p. 150—161. L. Spengel, on the A. p. of Hor., ibid. XVIII p. 94—108. A. Kiene, on the composition of Horace's A. p., Stade 1861. F. A. Beck, a contribution to the just estimation of the A. p., Giessen 1863. 4. Fr. Beck, the Epist. ad Pison. explained in its connexion and metrically translated, Eos I p. 196—214. J. Vahlen, Ztschr. f. öst. Gymn. XVIII p. 1—16.

235. The works of Horace were used as a text-book in schools soon after the poet's death. The necessity of having numerous copies of them rendered interpolation extremely difficult, and any attempts of this kind were soon rejected and remained without influence upon the text. These poems were also commented on at a very early time by Julius Modestus, Valerius Probus, Q. Terentius Scaurus, Helenius Acro, Pomponius Porphyrio, perhaps also Claranus. Scholia by Porphyrio are extant. Those which bear the name of Acro are of a later period. The number of mss. of the works of Horace is very considerable, but none of them goes beyond the ninth century. The almost immense number of editions as well as the treatises devoted to the illustration of his works prove to what extent Horace has engaged the attention of scholars.

1. Horace himself (Ep. I 20, 17 sq.) prophesied his becoming school-author, and as early as in the time of Juvenal (S. VII 226 sb a

he had become so. He is often cited by Quintilian, and sometimes also such passages (e. g. O. I 12, 40 sq. in Quint. IX 3, 18) as have been doubted by the hypercritical wisdom of modern time; also Martial and Caesius Bassus quote him. W. Dillenburger, Testimonia on Horace, Berlin Ztsch. f. Gymn. 1868, p. 322—332.

2. Suetonius (ed. Reifferscheid p. 47 sq.): venerunt in manus meas et elegi sub titulo eius, et epistola prosa oratione quasi commendantis se Maecenati. sed utraque falsa puto. nam elegi vulgares, epistola etiam obscura, quo vitio minime tenebatur. These attempted deceptions were so strongly rejected by general tradition, that they do not even survive in a single ms., nor do we perceive any fluctuation as concerns the extent of the extant works. The two new odes discovered by Pallavicini in the Vatican library (printed in Villoison, Animadv. ad Longin. p. 310, in Jani's edition I p. CXV; Preiss I p. 110 sqq. Peerlkamp p. XXVIII—XXX and elsewhere) are the production of a very late time; cf. Vanderbourg I p. 356 sqq. Ballenstedt, Hanover 1788. A dissertation concerning two odes of Hor., London 1789. 4. Richter, vita Horatii p. 127—130.

3. The vita of the cod. Paris, with which Pseudo-Acro introduces his exposition of Horace: commentati in illum sunt Porphyrion, Modestus et Helenius Acron omnibus melius. On them and Valerius Probus see below. On the supposed commentator of Horace, C. Aemilius, see F. Hauthal in Rh. Mus. V (1846) p. 516—532.

The Scaurus quoted by Porphyrio on Sat. II 5, 92 is no doubt Q. Terentius Scaurus; whom see.

Several writers, whose names we dot not know, had written de personis Horatianis even before the time of Porphyrio (see his note on Sat. I 3, 21. 91.).

The so-called Commentator Cruquianus is a collection of Scholia and glosses from various mss., especially the Blandinii, by J. Cruquius; see his note on Ep. I 18, 15 (p. 581 a): Blandini antiquissimus, ex quo comment. descripsimus. Rh. Mus. XIX p. 333 sq.

4. Editions of the Scholia by George Fabricius (Basle 1555. fol.), by Franz Pauly (Prague 1858 sq. 2 vols.) and by F. Hauthal, Berolin. 1864. 1866. 2 vols. See O. Keller in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 91 p. 175—183. Hauthal, Berlin Ztsch. f. Gymn. 1866, p. 398—409.

On the Scholia see W. H. D. Suringar, historia critica scholiastarum latinorum, vol. III, Lugd. Bat. 1835. W. Dillenburger, Horatiana, Aachen 1841. 4. W. Teuffel, Rhein. Mus. III. 1844. p. 473—475. C. Kirchner, Novae quaestiones hor. 1847. p. 59—64. C. L. Roth, Rhein. Mus. XIII p. 517. G. Linker, de Hor. scholiastis qui feruntur Acrone et Porphyrione adnotationes subsecivae, Ztschr. f. östreich. Gymn. 1858. p. 813—823. H. Usener, de scholiis horatianis commentatio, Bern 1863. 32 pp. 4. O. Keller, on the criticism of the so-called Scholia of Acron, Rhein. Mus. XIX. p. 154—160, and on Porphyrio, Pseudo-Acron and

Fulgentius, the Scholiasts of Horace, in the Symbola philolog. Bonnens. (Lips. 1867) p. 491—502. W. Hirschfelder, Quaest. horat. spec. (on the mss. and commentator of Cruquius), Berlin 1862. 4. E. Schweikert, de Porphyrionis et Acronis scholiis horatianis, Münster 1864. and De Acrone qui fertur Hor. scholiasta, Coblenz 1871. 15 pp. 4.

5. The number of the mss. of Horace amounts to about 250, most of which come from France, where the Benedictines especially copied Horace with great industry at the beginning of the Middle Ages. In Italy the mss. of Horace are comparatively more scarce, and the oldest ms. discovered there is of the eleventh century. See the lists given by Jani I p. I—XXI. Mitscherlich I p. I—XLI. Vanderbourg I p. 387—411. Hauthal, on the mss. of Horace in Italy, Jahn's Jahrb. XIII p. 387—411; on the oldest Spanish ms. of Horace and Acron (cod. Heinianus) Bonn 1847; Ztsch. f. AW. 1847 p. 398—403. C. Kirchner, Novae quaestiones horatianae. I. Quinquaginta codicum quibus usi sumus descriptio. II. De codicum Horatianorum stirpibus ac familiis, Naumburg 1847. 4. See his edition of the Satires (1854) p. XX—XXXVI. Keller-Holder, praef. I and II. Among these mss. especially the Blandinii of James Cruquius (from the abbaye de St.-Pierre au mont Blandin at Ghent) are of contested value. While his antiquissimus was made the principal basis of the criticism of Horace by M. Haupt and others, Th. Bergk maintained that the statements of Cruquius on his mss. of Horace were partly falsifications, an opinion adopted by O. Keller (Rh. Mus. XVIII p. 281—283), while K. Zangemeister (ib. XIX p. 321—339, see also Keller's reply, ibid. p. 634—637) defends the importance of the Blandin. See also Mützell in his Ztsch. f. Gymn. IX (1855) p. 850—877 with p. 946. F. Ritter, ibid. 1857, p. 359—361, and against him H. Düntzer, the fifth cod. Blandinius of Horace, ibid. 1857, p. 927—937. 1864 p. 876—878.

6. The arrangement of these mss. is very difficult on account of each of them having by the introduction of the readings of other classes more or less effaced the original character of their text (O. Keller, Rh. Mus. XIX p. 225). But three principal classes may, after all, be distinguished (Holder-Keller II p. III—VI. XVI—XVIII). The first consists especially of Parisin. 7900a saec. (IX—)X (A ap. Keller-Holder) and its close cousin, the Avenionensis (a) saec. IX(—X), Argentoratensis saec. (IX—)X (D), Monacensis 14685 saec. XI (E) and Parisin. 7975 saec. XI (γ). The second class embraces B (Bernensis 363, saec. VIII—IX), C (another part of Monac. 14685, V) (Blandinius vetustiss.), g (Gothanus, saec. XV). To this class belong also part of the mss. which bear the subscription: Vettius Agorius Basilius Mavortius V. C. (Consul 527). legi et ut potui emendavi, conferente mihi magistro Felice, oratore urbis Romae. The principal representative of the numerous third class is F (the original of φ and ψ = Paris. 7974 and 7971 saec. X), to which we may add λ (Paris. 7972 saec. IX—X) and ι (Leid. 28 saec. X), δ and d (Harl. 2725. 2688. saec. IX—X), ε (Einsidlens. 361 saec. X) and others. These two classes are, indeed, derived from one and the

same source, but the first is more trustworthy in spite of orthographical mistakes and the introduction of conjectures; the second is corrected throughout by a scholar's hand and rendered readable whenever his original was not legible; but the third ex archetypo pravo et mendorum emendationumque per levitatem factarum pleno manavit and subsequently propriis monachorum commentis plus in dies cepit detrimenti (Holder-Keller II p. XVIII).

7. Complete editions of the works of Horace. A full list in J. A. Fabricius, Bibliotheca latina I p. 405 sqq. Catalogus editionum Horatii ab a. 1476—1739 quae in bibliotheca Jac. Douglas asservantur, Lond. 1739. 4. (J. W. Neuhaus), Bibliotheca horatiana, sive syllabus editionum Horatii, interpretationum, versionum ab a. 1470 ad a. 1770, Lips. 1770. 1775. Jani I p. XXII—LXXIII. Praef. of the Bipont edition. Mitscherlich I p. XLII—CLIV. Preiss I p. 240—385. Schweiger, Manual of classical bibliography, Romans, p. 386—464. Wagner, Sketch of classical bibliography (Breslau 1840) p. 423 sqq. Kirchner's introd. to his edition of the Satires (1854) p. XXXVI—LVII.

8. Ed. princ. (fol.) s. l. et a., though printed in Italy between 1470—73. The other chief editions are: with Acro's Commentary, Milan 1474. 2 vols. 4. With Porphyrio, s. l. et a. (Patav. 1481). With Landin's Commentary, Florence 1482, fol.; and that of Mancinellus, Venice 1462, fol. and often Venet. 1519 (Ald.). Paris 1519. fol. Ge. Fabricius, Basle 1555. fol. With Muretus' Comm., Venet. 1555. fol. (Paul. Manut.) Lambin's ed., 2 vols. Lugd. 1561. 4. Paris. 1567. fol. 1579. 1587. 2 vols. fol. and often; reprinted Confluent. 1829. 2 vols. 8. Ex castigatione Th. Pulmanni etc. Antv. 1566. 12. Ed. H. Stephanus, 1577. 1588. 1600. Ed. J. Cruquius at first separately (Od. IV 1566; Epod. and carm. saec. 1567; Satt. 1573), then together Antverp. 1579. 4. see Mützell in his Journal 1855, p. 850—877); then (with J. Dousa's Commentary) 1597 and 1611. 4. Ed. Laev. Torrentius, Antv. 1608. 4. Dan. Heinsius (with a treatise de satira), Lugd. B. 1612. u. ö. French translation, critical and historical notes, by Dacier, Paris 1681. 10 vols. 12.; 4th edition. Amstel. 1727. Ed. R. Bentley, Cantabrig. 1711. 4. 1713. Amsterd. 1728. 4. Lips. 1764. 1826. Berolin. 1869. 2 vols.; the notes without the text by Sachse, Quedlinb. 1825. Ed. Cuningam, Hag. Com. 1721. Chronological arrangement, a French translation, and notes, by N. C. Sanadon, Paris 1728. 4. 2 vols. Amst. 1756. 3 vols. W. Baxter and Gesner, Lips. 1752. 1772. J. Valart, Paris 1770. J. Oberlin, Argent. 1788. 4. Zeune, Lips. 1788. 1802. 1815. Wakefield, Lond. 1794. 2 vols. J. Baden, Hafniae 1795. Wetzel, Liegnitz 1799. 2 vols. J. H. M. Ernesti, Berlin 1800, 2 vols. Haberfeldt, Lectures on the classical poets of the Romans, 4 vols. Leipzig 1800. C. Fea, Rom 1811. 2 vols., new edition by F. H. Bothe, Heidelberg 1821. 1827. Döring, Lips. 1803. Vol. I, ed. 5, cur. Regel 1839; Vol. II, ed. 2. 1828; ed. minor, Lips. 1830. Pottier, Paris 1823. W. Braunhard, Lips. 1831—1838. 4 parts. J. C. Orelli, 2 vols. Zürich 1837 sq. 1843. 1850—1852. Also editio minor (quinta, 1868). Texts by J. Chr. Jahn, Lips. 1824 and

often; ed. sexta, cur. Th. Schmid, Lips. 1855. C. Zell, Stuttg. 1828. A. Meineke, Berlin 1834. 1854. H. Düntzer, The criticism and explanation of the poems of Horace (without the text), 5 vols. Brunswick 1840—45; with the text, Brunswick 1849; a school-edition with explanatory notes, Paderborn 1868 sq. W. Dillenburger, Bonn 1844. 1848. 1854. 1860. 1867. C. F. Süpfle, Heidelberg 1846. recogn. M. Haupt, Lips. 1851. 1861. 16. Ed. G. Stallbaum, Lips. 1854. Cum novo comm. ad modum Bondii, Paris 1855. 16. Rec., codicum selectorum varias scripturas addidit Fr. Pauly, Lips. 1855. Scholarum in usum ed. G. Linker, Vienna 1856. Ad codices saec. IX et X exact. comm. critico et exeget. illustr. ed. Fr. Ritter, Lips. 1856. sq. 2 vols. In us. scholarum brevi annot. instr. Fr. Ritter, Lips. 1857. Cura W. Milman, London 1868. Recognovit et praefatus est L. Müller, Lips. Teubner 1869 (cf. Rh. Mus. XXV p. 561—533). Recensuerunt O. Keller et A. Holder, Lips. 1864—70. 2 vols.

9. General exegetical works on the poems of Horace. Mitscherlich, Racemationum Venusinarum fasc. I—IX, Gotting. 1828—1834. 4. Eichstädt, Paradoxa horatiana, 12 parts, Jena 1832—1843. 4. A. Weichert, Lectiones Venusinae, Grimma 1843. 4. L. Döderlein, Lectiones hor., Erlangen 1823. 1830. 4. A mite in explanation of Horace. Erlangen 1853. 4. W. Dillenburger, Quaestiones hor. I. Cologne 1838. 4.; Horatiana I. Aachen 1841. 4. II. Emmerich 1845. 4. J. W. Steiner, Commentationes horatianae, I. Coblenz 1841. 4. II. Kreuznach 1847. 4. H. Paldamus, Horatiana, Greifswald 1847. 4. Schröter, Quaestiones horatianae I. Saarbrücken 1847. 4. II. 1856. 4. Werner, Quaest. hor. Breslau 1847. Chr. Herbst, Lectiones Venusinae, Danzig 1848. 4. II. 1858. 4. J. Horkel, Analecta Horatiana, Berol. 1852. 152 pp. Brandt, Quaestiones horatianae, I. Münster 1864. Trompheller, A contribution towards a just estimation of the poetical manner of Horace. I. Coburg 1855. 4. II. 1858. 4. III. 1862. 4. IV. 1866. 4. E. C. Francke, Scidae Horatianae, Weilburg 1865. 4. A. Kiessling, Trifles on Horace, Basle 1867. 4. — F. S. Feldbausch, Explanation of Horace, containing introductions to the poems, 3 numbers. Heidelberg 1851—1853.

10. J. A. Voigt, on the use of the adjectives in Horace, Halle 1844. 4. Fr. W. Dahleke, de usu infinitivi horatiano, I. Breslau 1854. Fr. J. Hester, de infinitivi natura et apud Hor. usu, Münster 1858. G. Ebeling, de casuum usu horatiano, Wernigerode 1866. 4. J. Neuss, quaest. hor. grammaticae, Münster (Berlin) 1870. 49 pp. A. Rothmaler, de Hor. verborum inventore, Berl. 1862. C. Zangemeister, de Hor. verbis singularibus, Berlin 1862.

11. Treteri index horatianus, Antverp. 1576; arranged according to books and lines by D. Avermann, Brunswick 1668. Hence J. Verburgius' Index in the editions of Bentley's Horace. A complete index verborum is also found in F. Ritter's and O. Keller's editions.

J. H. M. Ernesti, Clavis horatiana, 3 vols. Berol. 1802—1804. Lips. 1833. Brevior, Halle 1818. J. G. F. Estré, Horatiana prosopographia,

Amsterdam 1846. F. S. Feldbausch, an explanatory list of proper names in Horace, Heidelberg 1853 (third vol. of his introductions).

12. Illustrations of Horace. Horatii emblemata imaginibus aere incisis notisque illustrata studio Oth. Vaenii, Antverp. 1607. 4. and often. Thirty illustrations on the works of Horace, drawn by Trommel (Karlsruhe 1829; with explanations by Sickler). An illustrated edition by Milman, London (J. Murray) 1850. Also Didot's edition ad modum Bondii (Paris 1855. 16.). Hor. opera illustrated from antique gems, by C. W. King. The text revised with an introduction by H. A. J. Munro, London 1869. 484 pp.

236. On friendly terms with Horace was C. Valgius Rufus, Cons. 742, the author of elegies and epigrams, a work on herbs, a Latin version of the rhetoric of Apollodorus of Pergamum, and of grammatical disquisitions in epistolary form.

1. Fasti cap. ad a. 742 = 12 b. Chr. (C. I. lat. I. p. 441): . . Ruf. abdic. in e. l. f. e. Fasti Colotiani (ib. p. 466): suf. C. Valgius C. f. Fragm. fast. municip. (ib. p. 472, IX). Quirinio et Valgio cos. in the fasti praenestini (ib. p. 314. 317). With Quirinius he is also mentioned Orelli 3693. 7041. (The cognomen of Saturninus belongs to the successor of Quirinius, L. Volusius.) Porphyrio on Hor. O. II 9 (p. 188 H.): Valgium consularem, amicum suum (cf. v. 5), consolatur morte delicati pueri graviter adfectum. Cf. Sat. I 10, 82. Perhaps he is meant by the Pyrrhus (*πυρρὸς* = rufus) of O. III 20 (Bamberger). Tibull. IV 1, 179 sq. to Messala: est tibi qui possit magnis se accingere rebus Valgius, aeterno propior non alter Homero, words at least expressive of the expectations cherished of his talent for epic poetry in these circles; cf. Hor. O. II 9, 18 sqq. Plin. N. H. XXV 2: post eum (see above 43, 1) unus illustrium tentavit C. Valgius eruditione spectatus, imperfecto volumine ad Divum Augustum, inchoata etiam praefatione religiosa, ut omnibus malis humanis illius potissimum principis semper mederetur maiestas. Hence the work must have been published. C. Valgius is also quoted by Pliny among his sources on b. XXI. The conjecture of R. Unger is therefore very probable that in Quintilian X 1, 56 we should read Nicandrum frustra secuti Macer (above 219, 7) atque Valgius (instead of Vergilius).

2. Schol. Veron. on Verg. Ecl. 7, 22 (p. 74, 10 sqq. Keil): similiter hunc Codrum in elegiis Valgius, honorifice appellat et quadam in ecloga de eo ait etc. (228, 1). Servius ib.: Codrus poeta eiusdem temporis fuit, ut Valgius in elegiis suis refert. ad Aen. XI 457: Valgius in elegis. Isidor. Orig. XIX 4, 8 (Valgius: a distichis). Unger, Valg. p. 223—265. It seems that in these poems he had also sung of Mystes (Hor. O. II 9, 9 sq.). Charis. I p. 108, 7 K.: Valgius in epigrammate. Unger p. 215—223. L. Müller Rh. Mus. XXIV 635 (hendecasyllabics). Unger considers Valgius to be the author of the Pseudo-Virgilian elegy

on Messala; see above 225, 5 n. 2. Philargyr. on Georg. III 177 (ut Valgius ait) quotes two hexameters by him which Unger p. 265 sqq. ascribes to supposed bucolic poems by Valgius.

3. Gell. XII 3, 1: Valgius Rufus, in secundo librorum quos inscripsit de rebus per epistulam quaesitis, lictorem dicit a ligando appellatum esse. Charis. I p. 108, 28 K. (Valgius de rebus per epistulam quaesitis solitaurilia dicta ait esse a etc.). 135, 23 (Valgius de rebus per epist. quaes. in support of lacer). Hence also Charis. I p. 102, 10 (et Valgius et Verrius et Trogus de animalibus lacte dicunt) and 143, 24 sq. (secunda ratio, qua Plinius ait Valgium niti). Unger Valg. p. 163—198. Diomed. I p. 387, 6 K.: Valgius de translatione (ait): comesa (not comesta) patina. Perhaps this formed part of his version of Apollodorus' *Τέχνη*. Quintil. III 1, 18 (above 36, 8). 5, 17 (causam finit Apollodorus, ut interpretatione Valgii, discipuli eius, utar, ita). V 10, 4 (epichirema Valgius aggressionem vocat). Ritschl (in Reifferscheid's Suetonius p. 529) calls attention to the iambic rhythm of the quotations from Valgius' Ars in Quintil. III 5, 17. See also Unger p. 145—162. Vague quotations in Sen. Ep. 51, 1 (Aetnam quare dixerit Messala unicum, sive Valgius, apud utrumque enim legi). De generib. nom. p. 91, 13 (Vallius: perfusam pelvem), where Haupt: fortasse Valgius.

4. Weichert, poetar. lat. vitae etc. p. 209—240. R. Unger, de C. Valgii Rufi poematis commentatio, Halle 1848 (510 and XVIII pp.!).

237. Other friends of Horace who themselves wrote in metre, were Aristius Fuscus, Fundanius, and Servius Sulpicius, and among the younger generation Titius and Iulus Antonius.

1. Heading of Hor. O. I 22: ad M. Aristium Fuscum. In the same way Hor. Ep. I 10 is addressed to him (heading: ad Fuscum Aristium grammaticum); cf. Sat. I 9, 61 sqq. 10, 83 = 91. Porphyrio on Ep. I 10 (p. 425 H.): ad Aristium Fuscum scriptorem comoediarum; but in part of the mss. of Acro on Ep. I 10, 1 (p. 422 H.): alloquitur Aristium scriptorem tragoediarum, which renders the whole notice dubious. Still less certain is his existence as a grammarian, since the excerpt from Varro in Eichenfeld and Endlicher's Analecta grammatica, p. 452 not. has been explained more justly; see above 196, 16.

2. Hor. Sat. I 10, 48—50: arguta meretrice potes Davoque Chremeta eludente senem comis garrire libellos unus vivorum, Fundani. This shows that at least his friends knew attempts by Fundanius in the field of the palliata, though we do not meet with any trace of them. See also Hor. S. II 8, 19.

3. Hor. S. I 10, 86 = 94: te dicere possum (among the docti et amici) . . Servi. Perhaps he is identical with the Ser. Sulpicius whom Pliny (Ep. V 3, 5; see above 26, 1) enumerates among the writers of

erotic poetry; cf. Ovid Trist. II 441: nec sunt minus improba Servi carmina. As far as the time is concerned, he might be the son of the jurist Serv. Sulpicius Rufus (above 161, 2 sqq.), the husband of Valeria Messalarum soror (Hieron. adv. Jovin. I 46 Vall.) and the father of Tibullus' Sulpicia (see below 240, 3). See Hermes V p. 33 sq.

4. Hor. Ep. I 3, 9 sqq. (a. 734 V. C.): quid Titius, romana brevi venturus in ora? Pindarici fontis qui non expalluit haustus, fastidire lacus et rivos ausus apertos? .. fidibusne latinis Thebanos aptare modos studet auspice Musa an tragica desaevit et ampullatur in arte? We do not know whether anything of the kind was ever finished. He is perhaps the son of M. Titius, cons. suff. 723 (A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. VI 2 p. 2011 sq. nr. 20). At all events he belongs to Horace's junior friends. See F. Jacobs, Miscellaneous Essays V p. 344—356. W. Teuffel in his translation of the Epistles of Horace (Stuttg. 1859) p. 208.

5. Of Celsus Albinovanus also (Hor. Ep. I 8, 1), the comes and scriba of (Tiberius) Nero (ib. 2) about a. 734, who is warned (ib. I 3, 15 sqq.) to beware of plagiarism, it is unknown whether he ever published his poems. He may be the Celsus whose death is mourned by Ovid ex Ponto I 9. Cf. ib. 37—40 to Fabius Maximus: multos habeas cum dignus amicos, non fuit e multis quolibet ille minor; si modo nec census nec clarum nomen avorum, sed probitas magnos ingeniumque facit.

6. Iulus Antonius (Mommsen, Roman Investigations I p. 35, n. 54 wrongly defends the praenomen of Iulius, which would be unheard-of in this period and would cause a metrical mistake in Hor. O. IV 2, 2, cf. 26) triumviri (Mark Antony's) filius (Suet. gramm. 18), born c. 710, Cons. 744, † 752. See W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. I 1 p. 1181, c. According to Acro on Hor. O. IV 2, 33 heroico metro *Διομηδείας* XII libros scripsit egregios, praeterea et prosa aliqua.

238. Domitius Marsus, (700—750?) a younger contemporary of Horace, is never mentioned by Horace; he was the predecessor of Martial in pointed epigrams, and also wrote erotic elegies (Melaenis) and an epic poem (Amazonis), also fabellae, and a rhetorical work de urbanitate.

1. Marsus still enjoyed the instruction of Orbilius (above 187, 3), though scarcely at the same time with Horace. He was still living after 735 (in which year Virgil and Tibullus died), but had long been dead at the time of Ovid's exile, a. 762; see Ovid ex Ponto IV 16, 3 sqq.: famaque post cineres maior venit; et mihi nomen tunc quoque cum visis adnumerarer (before my exile) erat; cum foret et Marsus magnique Rabirius oris etc. For his relations to Augustus or his intimate friends, especially Maecenas, see Martial VIII 56, 21 (cf. above 209, 3): quid Varios Marsosque loquar ditataque vatum nomina? ib.

VII 29, 7 sq. (n. 2). Horace's silence concerning him may possibly have originated in the offence taken by the self-conscious and sensitive satirist at the acerbity of the epigrammatist. It was easier to get on with such excellent men as Virgil and Tibullus; Marsus' epigram on the death of Tibullus occurs in mss. of his poems (perhaps derived from Suetonius de poetis); see 240, 1.

2. He is often mentioned by Martial as his predecessor, e. g. in the preface to I concerning the lasciva verborum veritas: sic scribit Catullus, sic Marsus, sic Pedo, sic Gaetulicus etc. V 5, 5 sq.: sit locus et nostris aliqua tibi parte libellis, qua Pedo, qua Marsus, quaque Catullus erit. VII 99, 7: nec Marso nimium minor est doctoque Catullo. VIII 56, 24: Vergilius non ero, Marsus ero. II 71, 3 sq. 77, 5 sq. (Marsi doctique Pedonis saepe duplex unum pagina tractat opus). VII 27, 7 sq.: et Maecenati Maro cum cantaret Alexin nota tamen Marsi fusca Melaenis erat. The collection of his Epigrams seems to have been entitled Cicuta (Bergk: Scutica). From this Philargyrius on Virg. Ecl. 3, 90 quotes an epigram on Bavius (above 228, 2) and his brother, recently supplemented from a Paris ms.; see H. Sauppe, Reports of the Saxon Society of Sciences 1842, p. 135—140, and the discussions in the Philologus XIII p. 222 sq. XIV p. 217. XIX p. 150; Rhein. Mus. XV p. 132. 152 sqq. XVIII p. 476 sq. 633 sq. From the same may be derived the hexameters on Orbilius (Suet. gramm. 9) and Caecilius Epirota (ib. 16), the incomplete line ap. Prisc. V 41, p. 168, 16 sq. Htz., as well as the hemistich ap. Diomed. I p. 304 P. = 319, 13 K. R. Unger, Epistola de D. Mi. Cicuta, Friedland 1861. 8 pp. 4.

3. Martial IV 29, 7 sq.: saepius in libro numeratur Persius uno quam levis (on account of his erotic poems?) in tota Marsus Amazonide. Charis. I p. 55 P. = 72, 4 sq. K.: Marsus fabellarum VIIII. (a hexameter). Quintil. VI 3, 102: Domitius Marsus, qui de urbanitate diligentissime scripsit. From this are derived the definitions of urbanitas and the urbanus ib. 104 sq. with certain reminiscences of dactylic rhythm. Cf. ib. 108 (Marsi, hominis eruditissimi) and 111 (dictum Pompeii, quod refert Marsus, in Ciceronem). He might, therefore, also be indicated ib. III 1, 18: ceteras missa ad Domitium epistola non agnoscit (Apollodorus). Marsus poeta is mentioned by Plin. N. H. as an authority in b. XXXIV (aeris metalla).

4. On Marsus see Weichert, poetarum latinorum vitae etc. p. 241—264, and the fragments ib. p. 264—269.

239. Among the poets of this period we should also mention Pupius, the author of lacrimose tragedies, and Maecenas' freedman C. Melissus, who wrote a work of jocular contents and was the author of a trabeata. Propertius' Lynceus seems also to have published poems.

1. Hor. Ep. I 1, 67: ut propius spectes lacrimosa poemata Pupi. On this Acro (p. 364 H.): tragoedi vel tragoediographi. Pupius tragoediographus ita adfectus spectantium movit ut eos flere compelleret, unde distichon fecit: flebunt amici et bene noti mortem meam; nam populus in me vivo lacrimavit satis. It seems more probable that these senarii contain a joke made on him by others and were subsequently placed to his account.

2. Sueton. gramm. 21 (p. 115 sq. Rffsch.): C. Melissus Spoleti natus ingenuus, sed ob discordiam parentum expositus, cura et industria educatoris sui altiora studia percepit ac Maecenati pro grammatico muneri datus est. cui cum se gratum et acceptum in modum amici videret, quamquam asserente matre, permansit tamen in statu servitutis, . . quare cito manumissus et Augusto insinuatus est, quo delegante curam ordinandarum bybliothecarum in Octaviae porticu suscepit. atque, ut ipse tradit, sexagesimum aetatis annum agens libellos Ineptiarum, qui nunc Iocorum inscribuntur, componere instituit, absolvitque CL, quibus et alios diversi operis postea addidit. fecit et novum genus togatarum inscripsitque trabeatas (above 17, 1). His literary activity would thus seem to belong to the later years of Augustus. Hieron. chron. ad a. Abr. 2014 = Aug. 40 = 751 V. C.: Melissus Spolitinus grammaticus agnoscitur. Ovid ex Pont. IV 16, 30: tua cum socco Musa, Melisse, levis. Panegyr. in Pis. 227 sq.: Maecenas apta togatis eruit et populis ostendit acumina Gai (according to Lachmann's emendation). Plin. N. H. XXVIII 6, 17: triennio Maecenatem Melissum accepimus silentium sibi imperavisse. The Melissus mentioned as a source by Pliny on b. VII, IX, X, XI, XXXV, may be identical with him (in his Ineptiae). From the same work may be derived the notice on Virgil in Donatus' vita Verg. 16 (27). But the statements of Serv. Aen. IV 146 (hos Melissus ab Homero Achabas appellari ait); VII 66 (Melissus, qui de apibus scripsit, ait), and the Anonym. de gener. nom., no. 61, should rather be traced back to the grammarian Aelius Melissus in the time of Gellius (N. A. XVIII 6, 1 sqq.). is praeter alia quae scripsit complura librum composuit . . de loquendi proprietate (ib.).

3. The Lynceus of whom Propertius (II 34 = III 32) feigns to be jealous is a friend of his (v. 1 sqq.), and therefore perhaps a member of the circle of Messala, though older than Propertius (v. 25 sq.); he also takes an interest in philosophy (v. 27 sq. 51 sqq.) and thus recalls the author of the Ciris (above 225, 2 n. 1). Until then he had written on pathetic subjects (an epic poem Thebais is inferred from v. 45 by O. Haube, de carm. ep. p. 29—32), but is asked by Propertius rather to devote himself to Alexandrine erotic elegies (v. 31 sq. 41 sq.). His real name is unknown, though perhaps Lynceus may be meant as a disguise for Lucius.

240. Among the elegiac poets of the Augustan age, Albius Tibullus (c. 700—735) followed indeed the Alexandrine

poets in his almost exclusive choice of erotic subjects, but soon discarded superfluous learning and based his poems on warm and true feeling. But though he is perfectly natural and his diction exceedingly simple, Tibullus knows how to describe the humour of the moment in lively colours, and expresses the increase and decrease of feeling with consummate art. His passion for the quiet peace of rural life, his yearning after true love imparts his poems a spirit of tender melancholy. His most perfect poems are those to Delia. In others it is discernible that the poet was surprised by an early death before adding the last polish. The first editor added to this collection elegiac poems by other members of the circle of Messala, among which we should mention Sulpicia's poems and (as the third book) those of a certain Lygdamus.

1. His praenomen is unknown, though perhaps A. — Domitius Marsus (see 238, 1): te quoque Vergilio comitem non aequa, Tibulle, mors iuvenem campos misit ad elysios. Hence it follows that he died 735 at the latest, being still iuvenis. Ovid Trist. IV 10, 51 sqq.: Vergilium vidi tantum, nec amara Tibullo tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae. successor fuit hic tibi, Galle etc. (above 29, 1). ib. II 463 sq.: legiturque Tibullus et placet et iam te (Augustus) principe notus erat. Vita: Albius Tibullus, eques rom., insignis forma (Hor. Ep. I 4, 6) . . ante alios Corvinum Messalam oratorem (above 218, 8 sqq.) dilexit, cuius et contubernalis aquitanico bello (a. 726 sq.) militaribus donis donatus est. hic multorum iudicio principem inter elegiographos obtinet locum (cf. Quintil. above 29, 1). epistolae quoque eius amatoriae, quamquam breves (those of b. IV?), omnino utiles sunt. This is erroneously enlarged upon in another vita, attributed to Jerome: epistolas familiares ad amicos complures et delectabiles metro et prosa dedit. He seems to have been well-off originally (El. I 1, 41 sq. cf. IV 1, 183 sqq.), but have subsequently suffered through the agrarian distributions of a. 713; he got, however, into comfortable circumstances through the recommendation of Messala (Hor. Ep. I 4, 7. 11. cf. Tib. I 1, 49 sqq. 77 sq.). When Messala was going to Asia, Tibullus at first refused to join him (El. I 1), but subsequently travelled after him (I 3, 9 sqq.) and remained ill at Corcyra (I 3, 3 sqq.). Horace addressed to Tibullus O. I 33 and Ep. I 4; Ovid Amor. III 9 is a poem on his death. — H. A. W. Spohn, de Tibulli vita et carminibus disputatio (Partis I. c. 1—4), Lips. 1819. 103 pp. N. Oestling, de Albii Tibulli vita et carminibus quaestiones, Upsala 1860. 21 pp.

2. Ovid Amor. III 9, 31 sq.: sic Nemesis longum, sic Delia nomen habebunt, altera (Nemesis, see v. 57 sq.) cura recens, altera primus amor. Martial. VIII 73, 7: fama est arguti Nemesis formosa Tibulli.

XIV 193, 1: ussit amatorem Nemesis lasciva Tibullum. Apulei. apol. 10: accusent . . Tibullum quod ei sit Plania in animo, Delia in versu It may be simply meant for a translation (planus = δῆλος). A third mistress of Tibullus' is Glycera mentioned by Horace O. I 33, 2 sqq. Fragments of the miserabiles elegi he wrote on her are probably found Tibull. IV 13 sq. See W. Teuffel, Studies and Characteristics (1871) p. 347—352. Spohn l. l. p. 32 sqq. H. A. Dieterich, de Tibulli amoribus, sive de Delia et Nemesi, Marburg 1844. O. Richter, Delia; a contribution to the life of Tibullus, Rh. Mus. XXV p. 518—527. Anonymous epigrams on (this?) Delia are found Anth. lat. 451 sq. R.

3. The earliest of the poems of Tibullus is the panegyric on Messala (IV 1), 211 hexameters written a. 723. This epic poem represents our poet's Alexandrine period. It attests a certain talent, but unripe taste, and both the subject and the mode of treating it betray the want of tact peculiar to a youth just come from the schools of the rhetoricians, features by which some scholars have been so far influenced as to deny Tibullus' authorship of it; see W. Teuffel's Studies p. 352—355. Of pretty much the same kind, though somewhat superior, is the poem on the triumph of Messala (a. 727), El. I 7. Similarly the elegies on Marathus (I 4. 9. 8.) and I 10 show mistakes and faults (especially I 4 the same far-fetched mythological allusions and the same rhetorical manner as IV 1 and 1 7), though they also exhibit a decided progress in an artistic grouping of the subject-matter (W. Teuffel, Studies p. 355—360). But the highest stage of the poetical development of Tibullus was attained in his elegies on Delia (I 1. 3. 5. 2. 6.), perhaps a. 730 sqq. They form a cycle containing a piece of genuine biography, a complete novel. See W. Teuffel, Studies p. 360—365. On the same eminence we may place the elegies treating of the love of Sulpicia (above 237, 3) and Cerinthus (IV 2—7, also II 2, where the fictitious name is replaced by the real name of Cornutus), variations on the same theme as is already sounded in the poetical epistles of Sulpicia (IV 8—12: W. Teuffel, Studies p. 365—369) and in IV 13 and 14 (ibid. p. 369 sq.). On the other hand, those elegies of the second book lack final polish, which treat of Tibullus' liaison with Nemesis (ibid. 370—372). In general see O. F. Gruppe, Roman Elegy: critical investigations and translations, Leipzig 1838, and W. Hertzberg, Halle Annals 1839. I p. 1009—1031. Franz Passow, de ordine temporum quo primi libri elegias scripsit Tibullus, Breslau 1831 = Opusc. acad. (Lips. 1835) p. 280 sqq. Kindscher, on the chronology of the poems of Tibullus, Berl. Ztschr. f. Gymn. XIII p. 289—301. Petersen, de quarti libri Tib. elegiis earumque auctore, Glückstadt 1849. 4. A. Zingerle, Observations on the elegies on Sulpicia in Tibullus, Minor philol. Essays I (Innsbruck 1871) p. 22—30.

4. Of the six elegies collected in the third book, five treat of the love between Lygdamus and Neaera, the sixth (III 5) is an epistle to friends. The author is a younger contemporary and imitator of Tibullus, born a. 711 (III 5, 17 sq.), who however lacks his spirit and

is altogether only a moderate talent, in every respect different from Tibullus (W. Teuffel, Studies p. 372—378). Ovid cannot be the author of these poems (ib. p. 378—381), and it is impossible to say whether Lygdamus is the real or fictitious name of this versifier. Propertius (IV 5 (6) and V 7, 35. 8, 37. 70 sqq.) uses Lygdamus as the name of a slave. But our author certainly belonged to the circle of Messala (Fr. Haase went so far as to consider his son, Valerius Messalinus, to be identical with him); hence also his elegies were added to those of Tibullus, in consequence of which his person remained perfectly obscure (W. Teuffel, Studies p. 381—383). In general see Eichstädt, de Lygdami carminibus, quae nuper appellata sunt, Jena 1819. 1823 sq. 1835 R. Törnebladh, de elegiis Lygdami commentatio, Calmar 1861. 37 pp. 4.. M. W. Fuss, de elegiarum libro quem Lygdami esse putant, Münster 1867. 77 pp. (a preposterous attempt to vindicate Tibullus' authorship). C. Stumpe, de Lygdami qui vocatur elegiis, Halle 1867. 24 pp. See also above 225, 5 n. 2.

5. Two pieces of the collection of Priapeia, the one (nr. 82) in elegiac metre, the other (nr. 83) in iambic senarii, are found in a ms. of Tibullus' poems (Lachmann's F), the first being originally an inscription from Padua, the second in style and subject different from Tibullus' manner. See W. Teuffel, Studies p. 383 sq. Wernicke, Priap. p. 134—137.

6. The judgments of Ovid (Amor. I 15, 27 sq.: donec erunt ignes arcusque Cupidinis arma discentur numeri, culte Tibulle, tui) and Quintilian (X 1 93; see above 29, 1). Like Horace, Tibullus also is fond of trichotomic arrangement: see Ritschl on Tib. I 4. p. 15 sq. 18 sq. It is not, however, advisable to exaggerate a native feeling for symmetry into mechanical calculation, as Bubendey (Quaestiones Tibullianae, Bonn 1864) and C. Prien (on the symmetrical arrangement of the elegies on Sulpicia, Fleck.'s Jahrb. 83, p. 149—157, and on symmetry and antithetic composition in the elegies of the Romans, Lübeck 1867. 4., p. 3—36) do. — Gruppe, on Roman Elegy p. 15—22, has shown how gracefully Tibullus deals with his pentameters in which he always contrives a pleasing parallelism with the preceding hexameter, though at the same time succeeding in being novel and attractive. Tibullus furnishes the first instance of limitation of elisions, even such as are not at all objectionable; he was followed by Ovid, the author of the Culex, Gratius Faliscus, Manilius, and later poets. For other details concerning Tibullus' poetical individuality see L. Dissen's Prolegomena p. XXXVII—CXCII, Gruppe p. 3 sqq., and W. Teuffel, Studies and Char. p. 384—386. De Tibulli arte metrica see L. Müller's edition, p. XXVII—XXXI.

7. Not a single one of the extant complete mss. of Tibullus dates back beyond saec. XV, and all are descended from one and the same archetype and full of corruptions, many also interpolated by Italian scholars of the 15th century, especially Th. Seneca and Jo. Aurispa.

The best representative of them is the Eboracensis (at York) of a. 1425, collated by N. Heinsius, now lost; A in Lachmann's edition. Next to this comes the Paris. regius 7989 of a. 1423, B in Lachmann. By C, Lachmann denotes three mss. of late origin, one on parchment (c) and two paper mss. at Berlin (d and e). Scaliger's Cujacianus was both older and better, but it begins as late as III 4, 65. To this should be added Excerpts (E in Lachmann), the most valuable of which are the exc. Frisingensia saec. XI (now Monacens. lat. 6292) made from a complete ms. of Tibullus: see Müller's edition p. VIII—X, and cf. Protzen p. 3—20. All the other Excerpts are derived from an earlier selection (perhaps saec. IX—X). The most complete (of about 260 lines) are those in the florilegium parisinum 17903 (Notre Dame 188) saec. XIII, printed by Protzen p. 22—32, and in a more complete shape according to the Thuaneus (Paris. 7647), saec. XII—XIII, by Meyneke p. 381—392. From the same or at least a similar ms. of excerpts are derived the excerpts of Scaliger (Meyneke p. 375), and of Vincentius of Beauvais (+ c. 1264) in his speculum doctrinale, b. V—XII (cf. O. Richter, de Vincentii Bellovacensis excerptis Tibullianis, Bonn 1865, and Meyneke p. 370. 372 sq. 452 sq.), which amount to 74 lines. Other excerpts see in L. Müller's edition p. VII. In all these the text of Tibullus is altered so as to suit the purpose of the excerptor; see O. Richter p. 57 sqq. (Vinc.) and Protzen p. 45 sqq. (floril. par.). The excerpts in Vinc. embrace only Tib. I—III, floril. par. also the paneg. ad Mess., Scaliger's Excerpts also b. IV. L. Müller (edit., p. XI sqq.) does not ascribe any independent value to these Excerpts, except the Frising., and they should certainly be used with much caution (Protzen p. 37 sqq. and Meyneke p. 369 sq.). See C. Lachmann, Haller Allg. Litt. Zeit. 1836, June, p. 251 sq. C. M. Francken, in the Verslagen en Mededeelingen etc. X (1866) p. 30—64, and in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 99 p. 207 sq. E. Wölfflin, Philol. XXVII p. 152—157. L. Müller in Fleck.'s Jahrb. 99 p. 63—74 and in his edition. E. Protzen, de excerptis Tibullianis, Greifswald 1869. G. Meyneke, on the Excerpts from Tibullus in the Paris mss., Rh. Mus. XXV p. 369—392.

8. Among the editions only that of Puccius (1502) seems to be founded on a ms. older than those accessible to us; but the text is treated all the more arbitrarily in the others. We should mention the commentaries of Broukhusius (Amsterdam 1708. 4.) and Vulpi (Padua 1738—1755. 2 vols.). In recent time the editions of Heyne (Lips. 1755. 1777. 1798; with Wunderlich's notes, Lips. 1817; supplementum by L. Dissen, 1819), J. H. Voss (emended from mss., Heidelberg 1811), E. C. C. Bach (Lips. 1819), J. G. Huschke (Lips. 1819. 2 vols.), Ph. de Golbery (Paris 1826). The first critical edition by C. Lachmann (with Catullus and Propertius), Berol. 1829. The same text is adopted in the edition of L. Dissen (Gotting. 1835. 2 vols.), on which see C. Lachmann's review, Haller Allg. Lit. Ztg. 1836, nr. 109 sq. p. 251—263. Text by M. Haupt (with Catullus and Propertius, Lips. 1853. 1861. 1868. 16.) A. Rossbach (Lips. 1855); and by L. Müller (Lips. Teubner).

9: Contributions to criticism and explanation by G. Klindworth, (I 10 c. annott., Lips. 1818. 4.; the same in Latin and German with notes by L. Tross, Hamm 1819), Präfcke (de difficilioribus quibusdam Ti. locis, Brandenburg 1837. 4.), F. A. Rigler (annotationes ad T., 3 Parts, Potsdam 1839. 1842. 1844. 4. 100 pp.), O. Dressel (Tib. I 1. Wolfenbüttel 1842. 4.), F. Haase (de tribus Ti. locis transpositione emendandis, Breslau 1855. 4.), H. Kemper (quaestiones Tibullianae, Münster 1857), O. Drenckhahn (On the criticism of Tibullus, Putbus 1862. 4.), H. Gräf (annotationes ad T., Memel 1865. 4.), F. Ritschl (on Tib. I 4. Reports of the Saxon Society of Literature 1866, p. 56—74), O. Ribbeck (de Tib. I 1 et Prop. III 34. Kiel 1867. 4.), Kindscher (on I 10, Rh. Mus. XVII. p. 148—152)., O. Korn (on I 6 and II 5 ibid. XIX p. 497—504; cf. W. Wagner, ibid. XX p. 314—319; Korn, ibid. p. 471—473: de codice archetypo carm. Ti. ebds. XX p. 167—175).

241. Sextus Propertius (c. 705—739) was a native of Umbria, but educated at Rome and admitted to the circles of Maecenas, after he had made himself known by his book on Cynthia. His later poems are contained in b. II—V. Like Tibullus, Propertius is exclusively an elegiac poet and the poet of love, but far more than Tibullus he is a disciple of the Alexandrine poets, brimful of mythological learning and frequently obscure; but he greatly surpasses his patterns in vivacity, originality of mind and passion. Though his feelings are very hot, his reflection is still more powerful with which he places himself above his feelings, and the same may be said of the art with which he embodies them in his poems. His diction and metre are likewise nervous, but the sequence of his ideas is often desultory. In the last years of his life, Propertius reverted to a design of his youth of treating Italian subjects in the form of elegies, perhaps in the manner of Ovid's Fasti.

1. His praenomen rests on Donatus' vita Vergil. 30 (45). Interpolated mss. and editions erroneously give him a second gentile, Aurelius (owing to a confusion with Prudentius) and this has thus passed into the spurious inscription of Ameria (L. Aurelio Propertio L. f.): M. Haupt, Reports of the Saxon Society of Literature, 1849, p. 260—266, cf. Th. Mommsen ibid. p. 266—268. 276. The poet calls himself only Propertius, e. g. II 8, 17. His home was Umbria (II 22, 9 sq. V 1, 64. 121 sqq.), probably the town of Asisium (V I, 125 sq. C. Lachmann, Ztsch. f. geschichtl. Rechtswissensch. XI. 1842. p. 117) where Propertii have been discovered in inscriptions (M. Haupt l. l. p. 261—263). The year in which he was born is not known and can only be guessed by various combinations. Propertius is certainly younger than Tibullus

and older than Ovid; see Trist. IV 10, 53 sq. (above 29, 1) and II 465 sqq.: invenies eadem (as in Tibullus) blandi praecepta Properti. . . his ego successi. Hence it appears that he was born between 700 and 710. On the other hand, no allusion leads us beyond the year 738 (V 6 to the quinquennales, and V 11, 65 sq. to the Consul Cornelius). There are, however, not many of these allusions. Thus we have II 7, 1 sqq. the abrogation of the lex Iulia a. 726 against celibacy and childless estate, and the repeated allusions to intended expeditions of Octavianus against the Parthians and to the East (III 1, 13 sqq. IV 3 and elsewhere); the extradition of the Roman standards by the Parthians (a. 734; see V 6, 80). The designation of Octavianus as Augustus (III 1, 15. IV 10, 50. V 6, 29. 38. 81) shows that the poems in question were written later than January 727; modo Gallus mortuus (III 32, 91 sq.) after a. 728 (see above 227, 2). Delicate health (and early death) are indicated by frequent dwelling on death (e. g. I 9. II 1, 71 sqq. 8, 17 sqq. III 5, 1 sqq. 7, 54. 19, 19 sqq. IV 15, 21 sqq. 21, 33 sqq.) The conclusions to be drawn from the poet's statements about his amores are very uncertain. His first love (after the assumption of the toga virilis, at the age of 15 or 16) was Lycinna; see IV 14 (15) 3—6. It is unknown how long this connexion lasted; Lachmann assumes one year, W. Hertzberg (Prop. I p. 17 not.) two. This was succeeded by his love for Cynthia, which had already lasted 2 or three years when IV 14 (15) was written (see ib. v. 17), and took up five altogether (IV 25, 3; cf. multos annos II 8, 13). It remains, however, doubtful whether this includes one year of estrangement (IV 15 (16) 9). It is certain that Cynthia was older than Propertius (III 10, 19 sq.; cf. above 211, 3) and died before him (V 7, 1 sqq.). — Apulei. apol. 10: accusent . . Propertium, qui Cynthiam dicat, Hostiam dissimulet. See above 138, 6 fin. In general Martial. VIII 73, 5: Cynthia te vatem fecit, lascive Properti. XIV 189 with the heading Monobiblos Properti: Cynthia facundi carmen iuvenale Properti accepit famam nec minus ipsa dedit. Juv. VI 7. Cf. Prop. III 20, 3. 32, 93.

2. He lost his father at an early time and suffered loss through the agrarian distribution of a. 713; see V 1, 127 sqq. cf. III 32, 55. He commenced to write poetry at an early age in the manner of Callimachus, but on Roman subjects; see V 1, 133 sq., cf. 59 sqq. On his relation to Ovid see Trist. IV 10, 45 sq.: saepe suos solitus recitare Propertius ignes, iure sodalicio qui mihi notus erat. He was friends with the younger (Volcatius) Tullus, the nephew of the Consul 721; see I 1, 9. 6, 2. 14, 20. 22, 1. IV 22. Not until after the publication of the first book does he seem to have been introduced to Maecenas; addressed to him are II 1 (v. 17) and IV 8; in the latter elegy he refuses a request to write on greater subjects, but at the end (if indeed this part belongs to the poem; see Heimreich p. 23 sqq.) promises poems on national subjects (probably like the greater number of book V). Propertius, like Virgil, lived Esquiliis (above 220, 5; IV 23, 24), perhaps with Maecenas; but such familiarity as between Maecenas and Horace

was rendered impossible by the difference of age. We find phrases in praise of Augustus such as arma deus Caesar dites meditatur ad Indos (IV 3, 1); Caesar dum canitur, quaeso, Iuppiter ipse vaces (IV 6 14); vix timeat salvo Caesare Roma Iovem (IV 10, 66); lacrimas vidimus ire deo (IV 11, 60). To understand this comp. III 7, 40: nocte una quivis vel deus esse potest. IV 8, 45 sq.: haec urant scripta puellas meque deum clament et mihi sacra ferant. — Also III 32, 18. 46. Horace is never mentioned by him, nor is Tibullus; but we often meet in Propertius with reminiscences of Horace, e. g. hoc erat in primis III 19, 1 = Hor. S. II 6, 1; pyramidum sumptus ad sidera ducti IV 1, 57 cf. Hor. O. III 30, 2; est quibus eleae concurrit palma quadrigae IV 8, 17 cf. Hor. O. I 1, 3 sqq.; i puer et citus haec IV 23, 23 = Hor. S. I 10, 100; with V 6, 65. sq. cf. Hor. Epo. 9, 23 sq., with ib. 79 (sero confessum foedere Parthum) Hor. O. III 8, 22 and others of the same kind. We might rather be justified in concluding from Horace's silence as to Propertius that the calm mind of Horace was not much attracted by the passionate manner of the young elegiac poet. See above 238, 1 and p. 389 with note 2. Imitations of Tibullus? A. Zingerle, on Ovid's relation I p. 55. 98 sq. 101. 103 sq. 132 and elsewhere.

3. The division into books and edition of the first book (monobiblos, see n. 1 fin.; hence the subscriptio I 22) was carried out by the poet himself; see II 3, 4: turpis de te iam liber alter erit; III 18, 1 sq.: cum sis iam noto fabula libro et tua sit toto Cynthia lecta foro. The title Propertii Cynthia, monobiblos, in the mss. is therefore just, as far as the matter itself is concerned. The second book contains much that is fragmentary, the fifth many things that were never finished and early attempts from the poet's papers (Heimreich, Symb. Bonn. p. 674—679 would ascribe part of this to Passennus Paullus). Lachmann's division of the second book into two (Ed. 1816, p. XX—XXIII) is borne out by two reasons: 1) II 10 (= III 1) is evidently intended to form the dedication of a book to Augustus, in parallelism with II 1 (to Maecenas), although book II is thus reduced to a rather small compass; 2) III 5, 9 sq. he says in picturing to himself his funeral: sat mea, sat magna est si tres sint pompa libelli, quos ego Persephonae maxima dona feram; a passage which must, therefore, belong to the third book. Cf. V 7, 50: longa mea (Cynthia's) in libris regna fuere tuis. Modifications of Lachmann's arrangement, very clever but not plausible, by Chr. Heimreich, Quaest. Prop. p. 22—39. The traditional arrangement is defended by Hertzberg I p. 213—223 by the probable conjecture that only book I was published by Propertius and the rest by friends after his death. Nonius p. 169 (v. secundare) quotes IV 21, 4 from Propertius III. On the date of publication of the single books see also B. Eschenburg, liber miscell. soc. Bonn. (1864) p. 83 sqq. The fifth book is not finished, and is proved to be the latest composition of the poet by the increased severity of metrical treatment. See R. Merkel's Edition of Ovid's Fasti p. CCXLVIII—CCLI 7. L. Müller ed. p. XIII—XLVII sq. The genuine origin of the

fifth book is attacked, though with unsatisfactory arguments, by Dom. Carutti (Sex. Aurelii Propertii Cynthia, cum libro quarto elegiarum qui Propertii nomine fertur. Editio in novum ordinem digesta, Hagae Com. 1869) p. XXXIV sqq.

4. Among the Alexandrine poets Propertius mentions as his patterns especially Callimachus and Philetas (IV 1, 1 sqq. 2, 52. V 1, 64. 6, 3 sq.). See W. Hertzberg's edition I. p. 186—210. In point of natural character, these dry scholars were really the antipodes of Propertius with his rich imagination, and indeed the flames of his passion often rise above his mythological manner; but that which after all attracted him towards them was their mastery over form, and this very adherence is proof sufficient that in spite of sensual ardour Propertius maintained his inward liberty. His books, the inexhaustible life of the huge metropolis, and his own exuberant fancy supplied our poet with the abundance of ideas which distinguishes him from Tibullus, but they also destroyed the even balance of his powers, the harmony of his colouring, the clear steadiness of his thoughts, and even shortened his span of life. On the rhetorical elements of his style see the careful collections in Hertzberg's Prolegomena, p. 105—186. On the refined construction of his elegies ib. p. 80—193, exaggerated to mere numerical calculations by K. Müllenhoff (Allg. Monatsschr. 1854, p. 186—201) and C. Prien (on symmetry and antithetic composition in the Roman elegies, Lübeck 1867, p. 36—53. Drenckhahn, on strophic composition in the third book of Propertius, Berl. Ztsch. f. Gymn. 1868, p. 177—205. 257—275.) On the metrical peculiarities of Propertius cf. Eschenburg, Observ. p. 1—28, Lütjohann, Comm. propert. p. 96—104, and L. Müller's edition, p. XLVII—LI.

5. Petrarch possessed (a. 1374) a *ms.* of Propertius (M. Haupt, Reports of the Saxon Society etc. 1849, p. 257—260); of those extant scarcely one is older than saec. XV. The principal ms., the cod. Neapolitanus (now at Wolfenbüttel, Gudiani nr. 224), which is no doubt copied from the archetype itself (probably a ms. of saec. IX) and which was formerly assigned to saec. XIII, is placed saec. XV by L. Müller ed. p. IX sq. Of the formerly over-rated Groninganus, written saec. XV in Italy, it has been recently shown that it abounds in interpolations; see H. Keil, Observ. p. 11 sqq. M. Haupt, Berlin List of Lectures, 1854 sq., p. 4—9. Chr. Heimreich, Quaest. Prop. (Bonn 1863) p. 2—21. W. Grumme, de codd. Prop. Groningano at Neapolitano, Aurich 1869. 4. Chr. Lütjohann, comm. prop. p. 3 sqq. L. Müller's edition p. IV sqq. Th. Struve, the various readings of the Helmstadt ms. of Propertius, Philol. XIII p. 387—394. [On a ms. recently purchased by the Bodleian library and which seems to contain some remarkable variations, see Academy II p. 56.]

6. Editions. The earliest printed edition appeared at Venice, 1472. fol. Subsequent editions are enumerated by Hertzberg p. 248—248. We may mention the editions by J. Broukhuis (Amsterd. 1702 1727.

4.), J. A. Vulpi (Padua 1755. 4. 2 vols.), F. G. Barth (Lips. 1777. 8.), P. Burmann and Santen (Utrecht 1780. 4.), C. T. Kuinöl (Lips. 1804. 2 vols.), C. Lachmann (Lips. 1816. Berol. 1829), F. Jacob (Lips. 1827), Paldamus (Halle 1827), Paldamus (Halle 1827), and especially by W. A. B. Hertzberg (Vol. I 1 quaestiones Propertianae; I 2 text with critical notes; II Commentary, Halle 1843. 1844. 1845), on which see H. Keil, Ztschr. f. AW. 1845. nr. 65 sqq. Schneidewin, Gött. gel. Anz. 1846. St. 97—100.

Texts by H. Keil (Lipsiae, Teubner 1850; which we have followed in our quotations), M. Haupt (Lips. 1853. 1861. 1868. 16.), L. Müller (Lips., Teubner 1870).

7. Contributions to textual criticism by C. F. A. Nobbe (Lips. 1818), Schippers (in librum IV, Groning. 1818), J. H. Bormans (Lovan. 1836). H. Keil, observationes criticae in Prop., Bonn 1843. W. Fürstenau, quaestiones Propertianae, Rinteln 1845. 4. Fr. Jacob, Philologus II p. 446—463. R. Unger, analecta Philetaea et Propertiana, Neubrandenburg 1850. 102 pp. 4. M. Haupt, emendationes nonnullorum Prop. locorum, Berlin 1854. 4. and 1856. 4. Th. Struve, Ztschr. f. AW. 1857, p. 237—246. F. Kindscher, Rhein. Mus. XVII p. 216—227. H. Kaffert, Philologus XX sqq. A. Lindner, Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 89, p. 836—839. W. Fischer, de locis quibusdam Prop., Bonn 1863. Chr. Heimreich, quaestiones Propertianae (Bonn 1863) p. 40—55, and novae quaest. Prop.. in the Symbola philolog. Bonn. p. 669—684. B. Eschenburg, liber miscellaneus (Bonn. 1864) p. 83—100 and observationes criticae in Prop., Bonn 1865. Chr. Lütjohann, Commentationes propertianae, Kiel 1869. 108 pp. (especially on book V).

L. Krahner, Attempt at an analysis of Prop. IV 1, 1—70, Philologus XXVII p. 58—87. Prop. el. IV 11 recens. et illustr. P. Hofmann-Peerlkamp (ed. J. C. G. Boot), Amsterdam 1865; cf. L. Müller in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 91, p. 777—791. On b. IV see also Drenckhahn, Stendal 1868. 4.

8. On Propertius see Manso, Supplement to Sulzer III. p. 5—40. H. Paldamus, Roman erotic poetry, p. 58—72. Gruppe, Roman Elegy I p. 274 sqq. and W. Hertzberg, Hall. Jahrb. 1839, nr. 127 sqq. Fr. Jacob, Propertius, Lübeck 1847. 32 pp. 4. W. Teuffel, Pauly's Enc. VI 1 p. 99—101.

242. P. Ovidius Naso, of a wealthy equestrian family at Sulmo (a. 711—770), received much rhetorical training, but at an early age devoted himself exclusively to poetry for which he possessed an uncommon formal talent. Yet he remained rhetorical even in poetry, dallying with thought and subject-matter, rejoicing in brilliant figures and witty turns, without any seriousness, higher aims and firm character, unconscious of the claims and purports of life, but ingenious,

piquant and original, and of unsurpassed mastery in all formal points, inimitable ease and gracefulness. In his first period he treated almost exclusively of sensual love, in the manner of the Alexandrine elegiac poets, though he always imparted to mythology, elegy and didactic parts a dash of irony by his frivolous selection of subjects. In his second period he wrote on subjects of Greek mythology and Italian legends, in nearly the same manner, but with greater care and earnestness. The works of his third period were composed at Tomi, and contain endless complaints of his exile and humble prayers for pardon.

1. His name rests on the authority of the mss.; he often calls himself Naso, e. g. Am. I 11, 27. II 1, 2. He was born 20. March (Trist. IV 10, 13 sq. cf. Fast. III 813 sq.) 711 (Trist. IV 10, 6 cf. Hieronym. on Eus. chron. a. Abr. 1975) at Sulmo (Am. III 15, 11 sqq. Pont. IV 14, 49 and elsewhere) in Paelignis (Am. II 1, 1. II 16, 37. III 15, 3. 8 and elsewhere), being the second son of a well-to-do (Trist. II 113 sq.) father. His brother died at the age of 20 (ib. IV 10, 31 sq.). He studied rhetoric: see Sen. Controv. II 10, 8 sqq. (p. 135 sqq. Bu.): hanc controversiam memini ab Ovidio Nasone declamari apud rhetorem Arellium Fuscum, cuius auditor fuit; nam Latronis admirator erat, cum diversum sequeretur dicendi genus. habebat ille comptum et decens et amabile ingenium, oratio eius iam tum nihil aliud poterat videri quam solutum carmen. adeo autem studiose Latronem audiit ut multas illius sententias in versus suos transtulerit. . . (9.) tunc autem cum studeret habebatur bonus declamator. . . (12.) declamabat autem Naso raro controversias, et non nisi ethicas; libentius dicebat suasorias. molesta illi erat omnis argumentatio. verbis minime licenter usus est, nisi in carminibus, in quibus non ignoravit vitia sua, sed amavit. . . adparet summi ingenii viro non iudicium defuisse ad compescendam licentiam carminum suorum, sed animum. aiebat interim decentiorem faciem esse in qua aliquis naevos inesset.

2. The official career of Ovid: (twice) XXvir, i. e. triumvir capitalis (Trist. IV 10, 33 sq.) and decemvir (stlilibus iudicandis, Fast. IV 383 sq.), a member of the court of the Centumvirs (Trist. II 93 sq. ex Pont. III 5, 23 sq.); judge (Trist. II 95 sq.). There are, however, but very slight traces in his writings of special knowledge of the ius civile, in spite of C. Iddekinge, de insigni Ovidii peritia iuris rom., Amsterdam 1811. 104 pp. A further continuation of this career was prevented by Ovid's laziness and preference for poetry (Trist. IV 10, 35 sqq.). He then undertook a journey to Athens, Asia, and Sicily (Trist. I 2, 77 sq. Pont. II 10, 21 sqq.). He was twice married at an early age and soon divorced (Trist. IV 10, 69—72); his third wife, a lady of the Fabian gens, and a personal friend of Livia's, survived him. His daughter Perilla wrote also poetry (Tr. III 7, 11—32; cf. V. Lörs, de

P. Ovidii Nasonis filia, Bonn 1832). His friends: Gallio (Pont. IV 11. Sen. suas. 3, 7. p. 21, 30 Bu.), Hyginus (Suet. gramm. 20), the poets Ponticus, Bassus, Macer, Sabinus, Tuticanus (see below 247, 1 sqq.) Cotta (below 262, 6), Graecinus (Amor. II 10), Atticus (Amor. I 9, 2. Pont. II 4) and others; M. Koch, prosopographiae Ovidianae elementa, Breslau 1865.

3. His exile. Decem lustris peractis (Trist. IV 8, 33 cf. 10, 95 sq. Ib. 1) Tomitas quaerere me laesi principis ira iubet (Tr. IV 10, 97 sq.). In Elba he received the first news of his accusation (Pont. II 3, 83 sqq.). He was relegatus, non exsul (Tr. II 137), and hence retained his fortune (Ibis 24). The description of his departure from Rome Tr. I 3. It took place late in autumn (in December he was already in the Adriatic sea, Tr. I 11, 3) of a. 762 = 9 A. D. (see Pont. IV 13, 40, according to which winter 767 sq. sexta bruma relegatum videt). The cause consisted in duo crimina, carmen et error (Tr. II 207). The first of these, his immoral Ars amandi, is often mentioned by Ovid who attempts to justify himself (Tr. II 211 sqq. III 1, 7 sq. Pont. II 9, 69 sq. 10, 15 sq. III 3, 69 sq. IV 13, 41 sq. Ib. 6 and elsewhere), and hence Sidon. Apoll. c. 23, 157 sq., Vict. Epit. 1, 27 mention his tres libellos amatoriae artis as the sole cause of his exile (Ovid ex Pont. IV 13, 42 says prima causa). It is indeed quite credible that Augustus should have been highly displeased with a work so greatly opposed to his attempts to promote moral life. But ten years had past since the first appearance of it, and the immediate cause must have consisted in quite a different error. Concerning this his error, not scelus (Tr. I 3, 37 sq. IV 10, 90. Pont. III 3, 75. cf. I 6, 25. II 9, 75 sq.) Ovid always speaks in mysterious expressions. Even the reason given for his silence, his unwillingness to renew Augustus' pain (Trist. II 209 sq. cf. III 6, 27) shows that he must have felt offended in his personal interests (cf. Tr. II 133 sq.: tristibus invectus verbis . . ultus es offensas . . ipse tuas). And as Ovid blames his eyes as the guilty part (Tr. II 103 sq.: cur aliquid vidi, cur noxia lumina feci! cur imprudenti cognita culpa mihi est! cf. III 5, 49 sq.: inscia quod crimen viderunt lumina plector, peccatumque oculos est habuisse meum; ib. 6, 27 sq. Pont. III 3, 74 sq.), it is highly probable that he witnessed without preventing the guilty act of some member of the imperial family, perhaps under the erroneous impression (partem nostri criminis error habet, Tr. III 5, 52) that Augustus himself knew of it and connived at it. This may have been the younger Julia's (Augustus' grand-daughter) adulterous connexion with D. Silanus (Tac. A. III 24). Against Silanus himself non ultra saevitum quam ut amicitia Caesaris prohiberetur (Tac. l. l.), but perhaps because the principal blame was laid upon Ovid, against whom Augustus was perhaps predisposed on account of his ars amandi, especially as this was published in the same year as Augustus was obliged to banish his daughter Julia, so that Ovid might be represented as a previous seducer. Cf. Th. Dyer, on the cause of Ovid's exile, Classical Museum 1847, p. 229–247. G. Boissier, l'exil

d'Ovide, Revue des deux mondes LXIX (1867) p. 580—612. (C. L. Roth, Stuttgarter Correspondenzblatt 1854, p. 185—187 discovers the cause of Ovid's exile in the visit he paid to Agrippa Postumus at Planasia; A. Deville, essai sur l'exil d'Ovide, Paris 1859, thinks that Ovid surprised Livia while bathing!)

4. The manner in which Ovid bore his exile can only be compared with the meekness of Schubart when broken down by a lengthy imprisonment; his complaints resemble those of Cicero in his exile; his crouching to Augustus is carried to a délire d'adulation (Boissier). In losing Rome, he had lost himself. When all was in vain, he prayed at last to be sent to another place of exile (e. g. Ibis 28). Augustus was already softened by the continual prayers of Ovid when he died (Pont. IV 6, 15 sq.), and his successor's cool breast was inaccessible to sighs and flatteries (ib. 17 sq.). So it came that Ovid died at Tomi or Tomis (near the modern Kostendsche), in the same year as Livy, in the second half of 770 = 17 A. D. Jerome on Euseb. chron. a. Abr. 2033 = Tib. 4 = 19 August 770 until 18 August 771 (in the Amandinus already in a. 2032): Ovidius poeta in exsilio diem obiit et iuxta oppidum Tomos sepelitur.

5. The ms. vitae Ovidii (especially Vindob., Vat. and Farnes.) are of no value, but Ovid's own poems are excellent sources for his life, especially Trist. IV 10. Among modern biographies the best is J. Masson, Ovidii vita ordine chronologico sic delineata ut poetae fata et opera veris assignentur annis etc., Amstelod. 1708. A detailed and laborious account is given by E. v. Leutsch, in Ersch and Gruber's Encycl. III 8 (1836) p. 39—54.

6. On the character of Ovid see Sen. Controv. II 10 (above note 1) and IV 28, 17 (p. 281, 8 sq. Bu.): Ovidius nescit quod bene cessit relinquere. Sen. nat. quaest. III 27, 13: poetarum ingeniosissimus, . . nisi tantum impetum ingenii et materiae ad pueriles ineptias reduxisset. Quintil. X 1, 88: lascivus quidem in heroïs quoque Ovidius et nimium amator ingenii sui, laudandus tamen in partibus. Cf. ib. 93 (Ovidius utroque — Tibullus and Propertius — lascivior). 98: Ovidii Medea videtur mihi ostendere quantum ille vir praestare potuerit, si ingenio suo imperare quam indulgere maluisset. Among Ovid's own expressions the following are most significant. Trist. IV 10, 26: quidquid tentabam dicere (in prose) versus erat; ib. 40: otia iudicio semper amata meo. He feels himself as the child of his time: (A. A. III 121 sqq.: prisca iuvent alios, ego me nunc denique natum gratulor; haec aetas moribus apta meis. . . quia cultus adest, nec nostros mansit in annos rusticitas). His ideas on the gods are very free: expedit esse deos, et ut expedit esse putemus. . . innocue vivite, numen adest (A. A. I 637 sqq., cf. III 654. Amor. III 3, 23 sqq.). Kruse, de Ov. moribus et operibus, Stralsund 1856. A. J. Reichart, the moral character of Ovid, Potsdam 1867. 58 pp.

7. As his proper domain and chief performance Ovid himself considers erotic elegy (Amor. III 1. 15, 13 sqq. A. A. III 343 sq. Rem. am. 389 sqq. 395 sq. Trist. IV 10, 54), in the peculiar metre of which he also treated subjects properly belonging to epic (the Fasti) or iambic poetry (Ibis). Among his predecessors he thought most of Tibullus (cf. Amor. III 8), from whom he frequently borrowed subjects, thoughts, illustrations, expressions and phrases (A. Zingerle I. especially p. 54—108), though he often turns them to frivolous use (comp. A. A. II 669 sq. with Tib. I 1). There are also allusions to the other literature of the time (e. g. Met. III 501 = Verg. Ecl. 3, 79 and other instances given by Zingerle, and Merkel Fasti p. CCXLVII sq.; Met. XV 871 and Amor. I 154, 2 = Hor. O. III 30, 1. 6 sq.), as indeed may easily be supposed of a poet of such excellent memory; he is fond of dressing up citations of this kind mythologically (Fast. III 465 sqq. = Catull. 64, 132 sqq.; Met. XIV 812 sqq. and Fast. II 487 sq. = Enn. Ann. I 47 Va.). He also repeats himself very frequently (e. g. Amor. III 2 = A. A. I 135 sqq.), sometimes, it may be supposed, quite intentionally (e. g. A. A. II 77 = Met. VIII 217). These repetitions and reminiscences from his predecessors in elegy show that Ovid's general laxity prevails also here and oblige us to limit the general opinion of his very great strictness in art. See the collections of A. Zingerle, Ovid and his relation to his predecessors and to contemporary poets. Part I: Ovid, Catullus (p. 36—39. 42 sq. 45 sq. 49—54. 131), Tibullus (p. 39—42. 47 sq. 54—108), Propertius (p. 109—130); Innsbruck 1869. Part. II: Ovid, Ennius (p. 1—11), Lucretius (p. 12—47), Virgil (p. 48—113); Innsbruck 1871. A third part (1872) is intended to treat of Ovid's relation to Horace. Ovid writes the mythological jargon of his time to perfection, though he is just as loose in this respect as in other positive statements (e. g. Amor. III 6, 31. 12, 21 sqq. Rem. am. 783). His verse is smooth, fluent and elegant, though attended with a certain monotonousness as applied to all subjects alike. M. Schmidt, de Ovidii versibus hexametris, Cleve 1856. 26 pp. 4. L. Müller, de re metr. p. 91. 408 sq.

8. On Ovid and his writings see Leutsch in Ersch and Gruber's Encycl. III 8 p. 54—95. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. V. 1847. p. 1028—1032. A. Haupt's introduction to his edition of the Metamorphoses p. III—XII. W. A. B. Hertzberg in the select works of the Roman elegiac poets (Stuttg., Metzler 1855) p. 227—248. Cavallin, ad libros Ovidii prolegomena, Lund 1859. A. Riese's preface to his edition, p. V—XII.

243. The most faithful image of Ovid's peculiar character may be gained from his erotic poems, with which he commenced his literary career: the three books of Amores, lascivious scenes, connected with the name of Corinna, the Epistolae (Heroides), fictitious love-letters addressed by

ladies of the heroic age to their lovers, with an addition of some spurious compositions; then also the three books of the Ars amatoria for either sex, wanton in tone and contents though with great knowledge of the subject and much psychological refinement — and its counterpart, the Remedia amoris, also the poem on female toilet, Medicamina faciei. In the same period Ovid wrote his tragedy of Medea and other works which have not come down to us.

1. Lines from the Amores and Ars were found on the walls of Pompeii: Rhein. Mus. XII p. 251 sq.' The *mss.* of all the carmina amatoria of Ovid are derived from an archetype (of 26 lines each page) where they seem to have been in the following order: Ars am., Remedia, Amores, Epistulae, Medicamina, perhaps the same order quo temporum intervallo fuerint ab Ovidio propter limae studium retractati (L. Müller, de re metr. p. 43—46 cf. Rhein. Mus. XVII p. 524 sq.). Editions: Ovidii amatoria c. var. lect. ed. C. G. Wernsdorf, Helmstedt 1788; recogn. (without Epist. and medic.) Luc. Müller, Berol. 1861. 16. Cf. L. Müller, on the criticism of the first part of Ovid's poems, Rh. Mus. XVII p. 522—542. XVIII p. 71—90. XX p. 256—264.

2. Early poems. Trist. IV 10, 57 sqq.: carmina cum primum populo iuvenilia legi, barba resecta mihi bisve semelve fuit. moverat ingenium totam cantata per urbem nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi (cf. Am. III 13, 1. A. A. III 343. 538. Martial. V 10, 10. VIII 73, 10 and other passages. Ap. Sidon. carm. XXIII 159 sq. calls her Caesarea puella. The subject-matter of the Amores was no doubt furnished by the poet's own life (cf. Am. III 1, 16 sq. 22. 53 sqq. III 12), though he shaped it according to his personal fancy. The obscenity of these poems is sometimes quite distressing (e. g. II 15, and especially II 13 sq. III 7). But they also contain such beautiful compositions as the elegy on the death of Tibullus (III 9). Ovid himself made two editions of his Amores: the first in five books (according to the epigram prefixed) c. 740 (Masson vita Ovidii p. 93), the second (which we possess) before the A. A., i. e. before a. 752: see Amor. II 18, 19 sq. A. A. III 343. 538. The epilogue (Am. III 15, 18) announces a greater work (perhaps the Metamorphoses). See Gruppe, on Roman elegy I p. 374 sqq. II p. 205 sqq. L. Müller, de Ovidi Amorum libris, Philologus XI p. 60—91. 192. E. Rautenberg, de arte compositionis in Ov. Am., Breslau 1868.

3. Ars am. III 345 sq. (after mentioning the Ars and the Amores): vel tibi composita cantetur Epistola voce; ignotum hoc aliis ille (Ovid) novavit opus. It is a special kind of the poetic epistle first introduced by Ovid (above 22). The poet is not very careful as to the exact character of time and situation, but even here the characters and humours of the moment are finely represented. Priscian X 54 (p. 544, 4 H.): Ovidius in Heroidibus. The letters of Penelope, Phyllis, Helena, Canache, Medea,

Phaedra, Dido, and Sappho are mentioned as finished by Ovid Am. II 18, 21—26, also answers to them composed by his friend Sabinus ib. 27—38. The present collection contains letters by 1) Penelope (116 lines), 2) Phyllis (148), 3) Briseis (154), 4) Phaedra (176), 5) Oenone (158), 6) Hypsipyle (164), 7) Dido (196), 8) Hermione (122), 9) Deianira (168), 10) Ariadne (150), 11) Canache (128), 12) Medea (212), 13) Laodamia (166), 14) Hypermnestra (132), 15) Sappho (220), 16) Paris (376), 17) Helena (268), 18) Leander (218), 19) Hero (210), 20) Acontius (242), 21) Cydippa (248). The last six differ even outwardly from the design of the rest of the collection, nr. 16 and 17 being moreover much longer than the others. In every way these six pieces prove to be continuations in the manner of Ovid, though without his talent, written by a clever rhetorician who had a knack of putting erotic suasoriae of this kind in verse. The oldest mss. contain only 19 poems and twelve lines of nr. 20; nr. 15 and 16, 39—142. 21, 13—248 (Heins.) being omitted; nr. 15 is generally isolated in the later mss. and occupies a place by itself after the other letters. This letter of Sappho is, moreover, suspected on account of imitating several passages of Ovid (v. 79 = Trist. IV 10, 65 sq.), and exaggerating his peculiarities rather clumsily (e. g. v. 24. 93. 207. 49 sq. 133 sq. 144 sqq.). Against Schneidewin's defence (Rhein. Mus. II p. 138 sqq. III p. 144 sq.) see J. Mähly (ib. IX p. 624 sq.). See Welcker, Rhein. Mus. XI p. 241, n. 10 and Minor Writings II p. 116—118. C. Lachmann (Berlin List, Summer 1848) p. 7: sex epistulas (nr. 8, 9, 14, 16, 17, 19) certis observationibus (especially metrical and prosodiacal peculiarities) plane confutavimus, de ceteris (nr. 3, 12, 13, 18, 20 and 21, 1—12), quamvis maxima sit dubitandi causa, certiora tamen argumenta quaerenda sunt. L. Müller, de re metr. p. 46—49 admits the doubts against Ep. 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20; but only of ep. 15 he assumes composition by some contemporary of Lucan, of the others „nullam . . post Augusti ac Tiberii esse scriptam tempus" (p. 48). See also Gruppe, Minos p. 495 sqq. K. Lehrs, Horatius (1869) p. CCXXII—CCLIV. L. Müller, Rhein. Mus. XVII p. 192—195. XVIII p. 87 sq. D. J. v. Lennep (ed. illustr. Amsterd. 1809. ed. II. 1812), W. Terpstra (ed. illustr., Lugd. Bat. 1829), V. Lörs (2 Parts, Cöln 1829 sq.). Ruhnkenii dictata ad O. Her. ed. Friedemann, Lips. 1831.

4. The letters sometimes found in the editions of Ovid under the title of A. Sabini Epistolae tres (first published Vicent. 1480, Venet. 1486) are the work of the Italian poet Angelus Quirinus Sabinus (Sabini poetae opera, Rome 1474, as an appendix to his Ammianus); see O. Jahn, Ztsch. f. AW. 1837, nr. 77. Gläser, Rh. Mus. I p. 437 sqq. A defence attempted by J. Chr. Jahn, de Ovidii et Sabini epistolis, Lips. 1826.

5. Ars amatoria is the title given by the mss., which is not contradicted by I 1 sq.: si quis . . artem . . non novit amandi me legat, and Amor. II 18, 19: artes teneri profitemur amoris (cf. Sen. exc. controv. III 7. p. 371, 21 sq.: est eius qui hoc saeculum amatoriis non

artibus tantum sed sententiis implevit). Ovid generally calls it only Ars (e. g. Trist. II 303). The first two books contain rules for men how to gain and retain the love of young girls (libertinae); b. III contains similar rules for girls. It is in vain that the poet now and then talks gravely (II 599 sq. III 438. 615 sq.) or plays the moral man (III 494. 613 sq.) and pretends to have written his poem solis meretricibus (Trist. l. l. cf. Pont. III 3, 50 sqq.), as love is here taken as mere sensual pastime. An ironical form of didactic poetry results of itself from the gay enjoyment which the poet experiences in dressing up his wanton subject-matter. He is well-acquainted with ordinary female nature, e. g. I 99: spectatum veniunt, veniunt spectentur ut ipsae; 705 sq.: . . ut pudor est quondam coepisse priorem, sic alio gratumst incipiente pati. The work was probably published a. 752 or 753. Allusions to contemporary history I 177 sqq., e. g. Parthe dabis poenas; . . ultor adest . . bellaque non puero tractat agenda puer. parcite natales, timidi, numerare deorum etc.

6. Remedia amoris, in one book, probably written a. 754 or 755, advice how to free oneself from troublesome passion, rather a weak performance when compared with the Ars, but not without psychological refinement and technical perfection. — A. Zingerle, Notes from mss. on Ov. R. A. (from an Innsbruck ms. saec. XV), in his Minor philological Essays, I (Innsbruck 1871) p. 31—34.

7. Ovid A. A. III 205 sq.: est mihi quo dixi vestrae (ladies) medicamina formae parvus, sed cura grande libellus opus. It was, therefore, written before the A. A. or rather before the second edition of it; the lively introduction was transferred (part of it without the slightest change) into the A. A. III 101 sqq. II 97 sqq. There are 100 lines extant, generally without any heading (Vat. according to Heinsius: de ornatu faciei); the rest was lost owing to the position it held at the end of the archetype (see n. 1); L. Müller, de re metr. p. 43 and Rh. Mus. XX p. 256.

8. Tac. dial. 12 extr.: nec ullus Asinii aut Messalae liber (speech) tam illustris est quam Medea Ovidii aut Varii Thyestes. Quintil. X 1, 98 (above 242, 6). Cf. Ovid Amor. II 18, 13 sq. III 1, 11 sqq. 67 sqq. Sen. suas. 3, 7. p. 22, 2 sq. Bu. As late as the fifth century A. D. it is quoted in the epistola Valerii ad Rufinum (ne uxorem ducat): lege . . Medeam Nasonis, et vix pauca invenies impossibilia mulieri. L. Müller, Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 95 p. 496. We have not any fragment of it except the citation in Quintil. XII 10, 75.

9. A poem on the nuptials of Fabius Maximus (Cons. 743) is mentioned ex Pont. I 2, 133.

10. Quintil. VI 3, 96: Ovidius ex tetrastichon Macri (above 219, 6) carmine librum (a whole book) in malos poetas composuit. A pentameter from an epigram of Ovid ib. IX 3, 70.

244. The fifteen books of Metamorphoses are in epic metre, containing versions of legends on transformations, from Chaos down to Caesar's transformation into a star. The subject-matter is borrowed from the Greeks, though treated with considerable liberty — a gay number of cheering and sad scenes from a world of wonders. Before his exile, Ovid wrote also his Fasti in elegiac metre, a calendar of astronomical and historical events, arranged according to the months and hence intended to form twelve books, the second half of which it was impossible to write at Tomi.

1. On the subject-matter see e. g. Mellmann, de causis et auctoribus narrationum de mutatis formis, Lips. 1786. Among the Greeks it had been treated by *Βοῖος* (*Ὀρνιθογονία*) and especially the Alexandrine poet Nicander (*Ἑτεροιούμενα*), as well as Parthenius and Theodorus (*Μεταμορφώσεις*), Antigonus (*Ἀλλοιώσεις*). Nicander and Parthenius seem to have been used by Ovid; this is in fact confirmed in the case of Nicander through Antoninus Liberalis. The Greek tragic poets also, especially Euripides (in his Hecuba and Bacchae) furnished some materials (perhaps through the medium of Hyginus? see below 257, 5). — Quintil. IV 1, 77: illa vero frigida et puerilis est in scholis affectatio, ut ipse transitus efficiat aliquam utique sententiam, . . ut Ovidius lascivire in *Μεταμορφώσεσιν* solet, quem tamen excusare necessitas potest res diversissimas in speciem unius corporis colligentem. Sen. nat. quaest. III 27, 12 sqq. (see above 242, 6).

2. Ovid Trist. I 7, 13 sqq.: carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas, infelix domini quod fuga rupit opus. haec ego discedens, sicut bene multa meorum, ipse mea posui maestus in igne manu. . . (23 sq.) quae quoniam non sunt penitus sublata, sed exstant, pluribus exemplis scripta fuisse reor. . . (26 sqq.) nec tamen illa legi poterunt patienter ab ullo, nesciet his summam si quis abesse manum. ablatum mediis opus est incudibus illud, defuit et scriptis ultima lima meis. . . (39 sq.) quidquid in his igitur vitii rude carmen habebit emendaturus, si licuisset, eram. See Trist. II 555 sq.: dictaque sunt nobis (quamvis manus ultima coepto defuit) in facies corpora versa novas. 559 sq.: pauca quibus prima surgens ab origine mundi in tua deduxi tempora, Caesar, opus. An abridgment of the Met. was made by Lactantius (or Lutatius) Placidus (e. g. in the edition of the Met., Antverp. 1591, in the Mythogr. lat. of Munker II p. 189—300). *Ὀβιδίου Μεταμορφώσεις* (a Greek translation by Maximus Planudes) ed Fr. Boissonade, Paris 1822.

3. Editions of the Metamorphoses by Gierig (2 parts, Lips. 1784. 1804, a new edition by J. Chr. Jahn, Lips. 1821—1823), E. C. Chr. Bach (with notes, 2 vols., Hannover 1831—1836), Baumgarten-Crusius (Lips. 1834 sq.), V. Lörs (Lips. 1843). A specimen of a new edition by Bormann, Halberstadt 1858. 4.

School-editions by Nadermann (Münster 1828; third issue 1855), Seidel (fourth edition, by Ideler, Berlin 1837), Feldbausch (Karlsruhe 1836; third ed. 1848), Lörs (Trier 1837), O. Eichert (selection for schools, Breslau 1850). J. Siebelis (selection for schools, Leipzig, Teubner, 1854 sq.; fifth edition 1867 sq. 2 vols.; also a lexicon, ibid. 1867), M. Haupt (vol. I, Leipzig 1853: fourth edition, Berlin 1867).

4. Liebau, de consilio Ov. in compon. Met., Elberfeld 1846. 4. Henneberger, Ov. Met. contin. seriesque, Hildburgh. 1846. 4. I. Bekker, variae lectt. cod. Berol. Ov. Met., Berlin 1853. R. Suchier, Critical observations on O. M., Hanau 1853. 4.; Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 79, p. 570—575. 639—643. M. Haupt, Berolin. 1861. 4. Gross, on the criticism of Ov.'s Met., in the Journal for Bavarian Colleges VI 9. Rappold, on the criticism and explanation of Ov.'s Met., Löben 1870. 62 pp. 8.

5. Trist. II 549 sqq.: sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos, cumque suo finem mense volumen habet. idque tuo nuper scriptum sub nomine, Caesar, et tibi sacratum sors mea rupit opus. The extant work is, however, dedicated to Germanicus (below 270, 4 sq.) and this as well as other traces show that after Augustus' death Ovid rewrote his work at Tomi (Merkel, Quaest. Ovid. criticae, Halle 1835: de tempore quo Ovidii Fasti scripti fuerint librorumque diversa condicione; see also the preface of his edition of the Fasti p. CCLVII—CCLXIX. V. Lörs, commentarii in Ov. Fast. part. I, Trier 1851. 4.). On the subject-matter see Fast. I 1 sq.: tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa canam. 7 sq.: sacra recognosces annalibus eruta priscis et quo sit merito quaeque notata dies. IV 11 sq.: tempora cum causis annalibus eruta priscis lapsaque . . cano (like I 2). In the astronomical details we meet with numerous errors (Pfaff, de ortu . . siderum, p. 62 sqq. Ideler in the Essays of the Academy at Berlin 1822, p. 137 sqq.), which Ovid perhaps took from his authorities (especially Clodius Tuscus, as Merkel supposes, see below 258, 6.). It is probable that the unfinished fifth book of Propertius suggested the subject to Ovid (Merkel, p. CCXLVIII sqq.). In its national and historical parts the work contains many valuable notices. Among the numerous mss. of the Fasti the oldest (saec. IX) and most important are the Petavianus I (A in Merkel), Arundelianus (B) and Vossianus (C), see the list in Merkel p. CCLXXI—CCLXXXII, and of the interpolated mss. ibid. p. CCLXXXII—CCXCIV. Also V. Lörs, de tribus Ov. Fast. codd. mss. (with the var. lect. of the cod. Trevir.), Treves 1857. 74 pp.

6. Recent editions of the Fasti by G. E. Gierig (Lips. 1812—1814, 2 vols.) and chiefly R. Merkel (ed. et interpr., Berol. 1841; cf. W. Hertzberg, Ztschr. f. AW. 1846, nr. 19—21. 31—34). School-edition by J. Ph. Krebs (Wiesbaden 1826), J. Conrad (Lips. 1831).

Observationes in Ov. Fast. by W. Gesenius (Altona 1806. 130 pp.), J. Chr. Elster (Helmstädt 1840. 4.).

7. In the last time previous to his exile (a. 761 or 762) Ovid composed an elegy on the death of Messala (above 218, 8); see ex Pont. I 7, 30: cui nos . . dedimus medio scripta canenda foro.

245. During his exile Ovid wrote his five books of Tristia, part of which were composed on his journey to Tomi, and the continuation of them in the four books of Epistles ex Ponto, addressed to certain persons who are specially mentioned, a work less elaborated; then Ibis, an abusive poem in elegiac metre, in imitation of Callimachus, against an anonymous person at Rome who endeavoured to injure the interest of the exile. The panegyric poems on Augustus and Tiberius (on the first even one in the native Getic dialect) have not come down to us; the didactic poem on the fish of the Black Sea (Halieutica), probably in imitation of Alexandrine poems, was left incomplete by the author.

1. V 3 proves that the collection of the Tristia was not finished before the spring of a. 766. The second book consists in a lively letter to Augustus. I 3 describes Ovid's departure from Rome. The letters to his wife (I 6. III 3. IV 3. V 5. 11. 14) are especially touching. Editions with ex Ponto by Verpoorten (Coburg 1712), Th. Chr. Harless (Erlangen 1772), J. J. Oberlin (Strassburg 1726. 1778); the Tristia alone by F. Th. Platz (Hannover 1825), Klein (Coblenz 1826), R. Merkel (Berol. 1837), V. Lörs (Trier 1839). Critical contributions by J. P. Binsfeld (Quaestiones Ovid. criticae, I. Bonn 1853. 8. II. Cologne 1855. 4. III. Rhein. Mus. XIV p. 30—40; Observationes O. cr., Bonn 1860. 4.).

2. Most of the letters ex Ponto are of the year 766 sq., the greater number in the fourth book of a. 767—769; see Wölffel p. 2053—2057. On the relation of this work to the Tristia see Pont. I 1, 16—18: non minus hoc illo triste quod ante dedi. rebus idem titulo differt, et epistola cui sit non occultato nomine missa docet. Ovid's store of words is quite inexhaustible and he has done his best in point of variation, yet the nature of the subject does not admit of much variety. Repetitions and slight mistakes of all kinds, in thought, diction, and metre, are not rare in these productions of melancholy. His flattery and adulation surpass all bounds. The principal mss. of these letters are (besides the Wolfenbüttel fragment saec. VI or VII) the Hamburg and the Bavaricus at Munich (collated by Harless, see n. 1), both saec. XII; all others are interpolated. A critical edition by O. Korn (ad codicum fidem emendavit, adparatu critico instruxit, Lips. Teubner 1868). B. Dinter, de Ov. ex P. libris comm. I. Grimma 1858. 4. II. 1865. 4. O. Korn, Observations on the mss. of the Epistles ex P., Wesel (Berlin) 1866. 4.; de carm. Ov. ex P. datorum compositione strophica, Rhein. Muc. XXII p. 201—216.

3. The title of Ibis was taken from a similar poem of Callimachus against Apollonius of Rhodes (v. 55 sqq.). It was written in the first part of his sojourn at Tomi (v. 1), though probably published (Pont. IV 14, 44 exstat adhuc nemo saucius ore meo) somewhat later, as Wölffel's conjecture (in his translation of the Epistles ex Ponto p. 2068—2070) appears probable that this poem was conceived to be the fifth book of ex Ponto and was there to occupy a position similar to the second book of the Tristia. The name of the person attacked is withheld (v. 9. 51 sq. 61 sq. 637 sq.), though there are threats of subsequent iambic poems with mention of the name (v. 53 sq. 641 sq.). From v. 19 (debuerat) we might infer him to have been a relation or former friend of Ovid's. The incongruity of the form and subject is admitted by Ovid himself (v. 46), as well as the fact that Callimachus' ambages and obscure (caecae) subjects (especially those taken from mythology) were not in general his business (v. 57—60). Editions with the Tristia, especially by R. Merkel (with a prolusio ad Ibin, p. 333—408), where (p. 460—475) we have also a vetus interpres Ibidis.

4. Plinius N. H. XXXII 5: mihi videntur mira et quae Ovidius prodidit piscium ingenia, in eo volumine quod Halieuticon inscribitur. ib. 54: his adiciemus ab Ovidio posita nomina, quae apud neminem alium reperiuntur; sed fortasse in Ponto nascuntur, ubi id volumen supremis suis temporibus inchoavit. In the list of his authorities on b. 31 ex . . Ovidio, and in b. 32 ex . . Ovidio poeta. The thankless subject-matter is treated in 132 lines without much success, though the authenticity of the poem cannot be doubted. Edited (with Gratius and others, see 248, 1) by M. Haupt, Lips. 1838. A. Zingerle, de Hal. fragmento Ovidio non abiudicando, Verona 1865. 28 pp. 4.

5. A poem on Tiberius' triumph (January 16, 765), accompanied by an epistle to Rufinus, ex Ponto III 4.

6. In point of linguistic interest we may regret the loss of the Getic poem in honour of Augustus, his successor, and his family, on which see ex Ponto IV 13, 19 sqq., cf. III 2, 40.

7. For another poem on the death of Augustus see ex Ponto IV 6, 17 sq.

246. The authority enjoyed by Ovid during the first century of the Christian era in the schools of the rhetoricians and still longer with the poets, as well as the smoothness and ease of his verse were the reason that at an early time and also in the Middle Ages many productions, especially in elegiacs, were ascribed to his name. Such productions are the old elegy entitled Nux, and the mediaeval jocular poems called elegia de pulice, pediculo, vetula, the lines de philomela and others, and last of all the Consolatio ad Liviam.

1. The philosopher Seneca shows his mental similarity with Ovid also in the preference with which he quotes him, e. g. de benef. IV 14, 1. V 15, 3. nat. quaest. II 44, 1. III 1, 1. 20, 3. 26, 4. The frequent quotations from Ovid in Quintilian show his great authority in the schools of the rhetoricians. As concerns the poets, L. Müller (de re metr. p. 136) enumerates the following as imitators of Ovid (in metrical peculiarities), though with somewhat exaggerated liberality: Lucanus, Homerus latinus, Calpurnius, auctor ad Pisonem, Seneca, qui scripsere Priapea, Palladius, Nemesianus, Claudianus, Rutilius, Merobaudes, Avianus, Sedulius, Arator, Boethius, et plerique poetarum minorum. An ovidianus poeta is mentioned in Gruter p. 446, 8.

2. In the Middle Ages especially the Metamorphoses (above 244, 2) and the Heroides were much read, employed and imitated: see K. Bartsch, on Albrecht of Halberstadt and Ovid in the Middle Ages, Quedlinb. 1861. CCLX and 501 pp. H. Dunger, the legend of the Trojan war (Dresden 1869) p. 25. 28. 33 sq. 39. 43. 46. 49—51. 53—58. 76 sq. 79 sq.

3. Nr. 2 of the Priapeia is attributed by Seneca controv. I 2, 22 (p. 77, 6 sq. Bu.) to Ovid (Ovidianum illud inepta loci, a passage found Priap. 2, 8.) It is possible that other pieces of that collection are by Ovid (cf. Warnicke, Priapei. p. 120—124. 126—131), though it is impossible to state which. Those which agree with passages in Ovid should rather be attributed to others than to him.

4. The elegy of Nux (in 182 lines) is somewhat talkative and rhetorically ornamented (e. g. v. 108 sqq. 175 sqq.), but of fluent metre and in parts of graceful style. The subject is not badly chosen, being the complaint of a nut-tree concerning ill treatment, with mournful reflections on better times and manners (e. g. v. 23 sq.). Caesar . . deus v. 142 sqq. Nothing prevents us from assuming the early composition of this poem after Ovid's time. L. Müller, de re metr. p. 49. cf. A. Riese in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 101, p. 282. It is printed e. g. in W. E. Weber's Corpus poett. latt. p. 1393 sq. and with a commentary by F. Lindemann, Zittau 1844. 4.

5. Most of the apocryphal poems attributed to Ovid may be found in Goldast's Catalecta Ovidii, Francof. 1610. Of mediaeval origin are the verses de philomela (above 23, 5), in pediculos, de medicamine aurium (a ms. copy at Bern, Sinner I p. 543 sqq.), de pulice (by Ofilius Sergianus), Somnium, and the three books de vetula, on which see Hipp. Cochéris, La Vieille, ou les derniers amours d'Ovide, poème français du XIV siècle, traduit du latin de Rich. de Fournival par J. Lefèvre, publié et précédé de recherches sur l'auteur de Vetula, Paris 1861. De anulo is in Ovid Amor. II 15, but has frequently been copied with spurious pieces in many mss. (L. Müller).

6. As concerns the Consolatio ad Liviam Augustam de morte Drusi Neronis (e. g. in Weber's Corpus poett. latt. p. 1389—1392), which Scaliger ascribed to Pedo Albinovanus, we possess no ms. of it, but

it appears for the first time in the editio princeps of Ovid, a. 1471. The suspicion which hence arises of its having been composed in the fifteenth century by some Italian scholar becomes almost certainty by the absence of all positive information which might not be derived from well-known writers, by the numerous reminiscences from Ovid, and the modern colouring of the ideas. See M. Haupt, Epicedion Drusi cum commentariis, Lips. 1849. 4., unsuccessfully impugned by Adler, de Ovidii consolatione etc., Anclam 1851. 4.

7. The most important editions of the complete works of Ovid are: ed. princeps at the same time at Bologna (1471 fol.) and at Rome (1471 f. fol. 2 vols.). Aldina 3 vols. 1503. 1503 and (by A. Naugerius) 1515 sq. Iuntina (by A. Francinus and others), Flor. 1525, 3 vols. Notes by Herc. Ciofanius of Sulmo, collected Antverp. 1583, and also in G. Bersmann's editions (Lips. 1582—1620). A text with notes by Glareanus and Longolius Lips. 1589, 3 vols. and elsewhere. Editions by D. Heinsius (Lugd. Bat. 1629, 3 vols.), of inportance those by Nicol. Heinsius (Amstelod. 1652. 1658, the best 1661, 3 vols.; N. Heinsii comm. in Ov. ed. J. F. Fischer, Lips. 1758, 2 parts). The exegetical materials were increased by P. Burmann (Amstelod. 1727. 4. Praefatio ib. 1756. 4.). Texts by Miller (Berol. 1757. 4 vols.), J. F. Fischer (Lips. 1758, 2 vols.). Bipont. 1783 (3 vols.), Chr. W. Mitscherlich (Gotting. 1796—1798, 2 vols.; 1819), J. Chr. Jahn (Lips. 1828—1832, 2 vols., not finished), in W. E. Weber's Corpus poetarum latinorum (Francof. 1833), and especially rec. R. Merkel, Lips. (Teubner) 1853 sq. 3 vols. Ed. A. Riese, Lips. Tauchnitz, vol. I. 1871.

8. M. Isler, Eclogae Ovidianae, Hamburg 1853. Ovidii carmina selecta in usum schol. ed. C. I. Grysar, Vienna 1854.

9. Contributions to the criticism of the text (Quaest. Ovid. criticae) by R. Merkel (see 244, 4), Linder (Upsala 1852), J. P. Binsfeld (above 245, 1), G. M. Thomas (Symbolae crit., München 1840; Ztschr. f. österr. Gymn. V p. 261—279), H. Schütze (Quaest. I. Spandau 1861. 4.). A. Rothmaler (Emend. Ov., Nordhausen 1870. 4.).

247. Among those friends of Ovid's who attempted poetical composition, the oldest are the epic poet Ponticus who was also on friendly terms with Propertius, the translator Tuticanus, Macer who was somewhat younger, and wrote an epic poem on the Trojan legends, and Sabinus, the author of answers to the heroic Epistles of Ovid and of a work resembling his Fasti; then also Cornelius Severus, an epic poet who chose his subject from the history of the time (bellum siculum); Pedo Albinovanus, the author both of a Theseis and of an epic poem on a subject derived from contemporary history, as well as of epigrams; and others. Outside of this

circle, Rabirius and Sextilius Ena of Corduba chose their subjects from the recent Civil Wars. Most of the epic poets, however, followed the track of the Alexandrines, and besides Homer, the Cyclic poets were also made use of. Epic poems of this kind on mythological subjects were written by Iulus Antonius and Largus, Camerinus, Lupus, Abronius Silo, and others.

1. Trist. IV 10, 47: Ponticus heroo, Bassus quoque clarus iambo, dulcia convictus membra fuere mei. An allusion to the latter occurs probably ex Pont. IV 16, 21 sq.: velivolique maris vates, cui credere possis carmina caeruleos composuisse deos. (See, however, also O. Haube, carm. ep. p. 19 sq.). That he wrote a Thebaid appears from Propert. I 7, 1—3: dum tibi Cadmeae dicuntur, Pontice, Thebae armaque fraternae tristia militiae, atque, ita sim felix, primo contendis Homero etc. cf. ib. 9, 9 sqq.: quid tibi nunc misero prodest grave dicere carmen aut Amphioniae moenia flere lyrae? It seems probable that he imitated Antimachus. He seems to have been still living when Ovid wrote ex Pont. IV 16.

2. Tuticanus is mentioned as the friend of Ovid, with whom he was of the same age, ex Pont. IV 12, 20 sqq. Besides this letter, also nr. 14 is addressed to him, both with the observation that the trochaic measure of the name did not agree with dactylic metre. Hence his name is avoided ib. 16, 27: et qui maeoniam Phaeacida vertit (the translator of the Odyssey). But that he is meant appears from ib. 12, 27 sq.: dignam maeoniis Phaeacida condere chartis cum te Pierides perdocuere tuae. Ib. 25 sq. shows that he was very strict in point of form.

3. Macer (who should be distinguished from the earlier didactic poet of the same name, above 219, 6 sqq.) was Ovid's companion in his travels in Asia and Sicily (Pont. II 10, 21—28. 31—42). He calls him Iliacus, Pont. IV 16, 6, and he seems to have treated the legends antecedent to the Iliad, i. e. Antehomerica (Am. II 18, 1 sq.: carmen ad iratum dum tu perducis Achillen primaque iuratis induis arma viris, nos, Macer, . . cessamus), but also Posthomerica (Pont. II 10, 13 sq.: tu canis aeterno quidquid restabat Homero, ne careant summa troica bella manu), no doubt in imitation of the Cyclic poets. He is perhaps identical with the Macer mentioned by Quintilian VI 3, 96 (see above 219, 6). The opinion (of J. B. Pius, Wernsdorf, Walther, Wölffel and others) is probable that he is identical with (the grandson of the Pompeian Theophanes of Mytilene) Pompeius Macer to whom Augustus ordinandas bybliothecas delegaverat (Suet. Caes. 56 extr.) and whose son was no doubt the praetor of a. 768 Pompeius Macer (Tac. A. I 72, cf. VI 18 praetorius), and who, together with his father (illustris eques rom., Tac. A. VI 18) died a voluntary death a. 786 =

33 A. D., when his sister Pompeia Macrina was accused of high treason and in danger of exile (Tac. A. VI 18).

4. Ovid Amor. II 18, 27: meus Sabinus. Pont. IV 16, 13—16: et qui Penelopae rescribere iussit Ulixen (cf. Amor. II 18, 27—34) ... quique tuam Troezena (? Merkel ed. Fast. p. CCLIV: heroon, very improbable side by side with rescribere iussit etc.; Röper: Chrysen) imperfectumque Dierum deseruit celeri morte Sabinus opus. Hence it appears that the epic poem, the title of which is corrupt, was actually finished. In point of chronology he might be the Sabinus mentioned by Hor. Ep. I 5, 27. His gentile is not known. See also above 243, 4.

5. Quintil. X 1, 89: Cornelius Severus, etiamsi versificator quam poeta melior, si tamen ad exemplar primi libri bellum Siculum (with Sex. Pompejus, a. 716 sqq.) perscripsisset, vindicaret sibi iure secundum locum (among the Roman epic poets). From him may be the quotation in Sen. suas. 2, 12 (p. 14, 13 sq. Bu.), the *σπονδαίζων* in Schol. Pers. I 95, the quotations in Charis. p. 80, 7 sq. 81, 16 sq. 86, 7 sqq. 100, 24 sq. 107, 29 sq. Diomed. p. 378, 2 sq. K., as well as the description of Aetna mentioned by Sen. Ep. 79, 5 (cf. Appian. b. c. V 117). From the same also the 25 eloquent and elegant hexameters on the death of Cicero ap. Sen. suas. 6, 26 (with the introductory observation: nemo ex tot disertissimis viris melius Ciceronis mortem deflevit quam Severus Cornelius). The quotations in Charisius 287, 4 (without special mention of the name) and p. 105, 19 are uncertain; in the latter place the gap may be filled up from the gramm. de gener. nom. p. 94 H. and then the words follow: cuius (Corn. Sev.?) moveremur, inquit Plinius, auctoritate, si quidquam eo carmine puerilius dixisset. Also Diomede p. 375, 22 K. is doubtful, though after *Severus* the quotation given by Priscian X 57 (p. 546 sq. Htz, in VIII de statu suo: ad quem etc.) seems to have perished; this quotation has not yet been put into such elegant metre as would agree with the well-known elegance of Corn. Sev., whence we may perhaps ascribe it to Cassius Sev. Ovid ex Pont. IV 2 is addressed to Corn. Sev. (v. 1: o vates magnorum maxime regum; 11 sq.: fertile pectus habes interque Helicona colentes uberius nulli provenit ista seges, i. e. carmina), and so is perhaps also I 8 (v. 2: pars animae magna, Severe, meae, 25: o iucunde sodalis), though IV 2 Ovid apologizes eius adhuc nomen nostros tacuisse libellos (v. 3). In general see Wernsdorf poetae latt. min. IV p. 25—27 and the fragments ib. p. 217—228. J. Becker, Ztschr. f. AW. 1848, nr. 74 sq. p. 587 sqq. O. Haube, de carm. ep. (Breslau 1870) p. 10—14.

6. Pedo Albinovanus (Sen. Ep. 122, 15; Alb. Pedo in Sen. controv. p. 138, 7 = 351, 19 Bu.), doctus in Martial II 77, 5 (above 238, 2), sidereus in Ovid Pont. IV 16, 6; carissime ib. IV 10, 3. The philosopher Seneca knew him personally and calls him fabulator (talker) elegantissimus (Ep. 122, 15 sq.). A witty saying of his in Quintil. VI 3, 61, cf. Sen. controv. II 10, 12 (p. 138 Bu.). His epic poetry is cri-

ticized by Quintil. X 1, 90: Rabirius ac Pedo non indigni cognitione, si vacet. On his Theseis Ovid Pont. IV 10, 71. 75 sq. Sen. suas. I, 14 sq. (p. 7 sq. Bu.): latini declamatores in descriptionem Oceani non nimis viguerunt. . . nemo illorum potuit tanto spiritu dicere quanto Pedo qui navigante Germanico (cf. Tac. A. II 23 sq.) dicit: iam pridem etc. which is followed by 24 hexameters of sonorous cadence, though rather rhetorical in style (commented on by Wernsdorf poetae lat. min. IV p. 229—235, cf. M. Haupt, Hermes III p. 209 sq.). O. Haube, de carm. ep. (1870) p. 14 sqq. refers to him also Priscian VII 5, 22 (p. 304, 20 sqq. H.): Albinus rerum romanarum I (succeeded by three hexameters), where he reads Albinovanus. As an epigrammatist he followed Domitius Marsus; see above 238, 2.

7. Carus (the gentile unknown), the tutor of the sons of Germanicus (Pont. IV 13, 47 sq.), non dubios inter sodales, vere carus (ib. 1 sq. cf. Trist. III 5, 17 sq.). On their joint studies in poetry see Pont. IV 13, 43. An allusion to his epic poem on Hercules ib. 11 sq. and 16, 7 sq.: et qui Iunonem laesisset in Hercule (by composing poetry on him) Carus, Iunonis si non iam gener ille foret. Cf. Sen. Herc. Oet. 1441, and Octavia 216 sq.: nec Iunonis iam timet iras, cuius gener est (L. Müller).

8. A list of epic poets who wrote on mythological subjects is given by Ovid, ex Pont. IV 16, 17—19: ingeniique sui dictus cognomine Largus, gallica qui phrygium duxit in arva senem. quique canit domitam Camerinus ab Hercule Troiam. ib. 25 sq.: Trinacriusque suae Perseidos auctor, et auctor Tantalidae reducis Tyndaridosque Lupus. Largus who appears to have written on the legendary settlement of Antenor in Cisalpine Gaul, is supposed to be the faithless friend and accuser of Cornelius Gallus, called Valerius Largus by Dio LIII 23 sq. Camerinus whose subject was the capture of Troy, might be identical with Q. Sulpicius Camerinus, Consul 762. Lupus who wrote an epic poem on the return of Menelaus and Helena, is generally identified with the rhetorician Rutilius Lupus (below 265). Trinacrius (= Siculus?) does not look like a proper name; a Perseid had been written among the Greeks by Choerilus and Musaeus. See Merkel's edition of the Tristia etc. p. 376 sq. Tuscus who is mentioned by Ovid Pont. IV 16, 20 (quique sua nomen Phyllide Tuscus habet) among epic poets, is by Merkel (p. 373) considered to be the grammarian Clodius Tuscus (below 258, 6). On Iulus Antonius see above 237, 6.

9. Vellei. Pat. II 36, 3: inter quae (ingenia) maxime nostri aevi eminent princeps carminum Vergilius Rabiriusque (while Horace is not mentioned!). Quintilian judges more sensibly X 1, 90 (above n. 6). Ovid Pont. IV 16, 5: magnique Rabirius oris. A hexameter by Rabirius ap. Charis. I p. 65, 9 sq. K. Other notices in the Anonymus de generibus nominum (Giessen 1850. 4.) nr. 107. 110. 315 = p. 78, 11 sq. 17 sq. 99, 8 sq. in Haupt's Halieut., and Rhein. Mus. III p. 307 sq.

On the subject of his poem see Sen. de benef. VI 3, 1: egregie mihi videtur M. Antonius apud Rabirium poetam . . exclamare: hoc habeo quodcumque dedi. According to this subject, he is generally supposed to be the author of the fragment discovered in the rolls of Herculaneum on the battle of Actium and the death of Cleopatra; see Volumina Hercul. (Naples 1809. fol.) II p. 7 sqq. (printed also in other places, e. g. in Fea's edition of Horace p. XXI—XXIII). J. Th. Kreyssig, carminis latini de bello actiaco sive alexandrino fragmenta, Lips. 1814. 4. and after his comm. de Sall. hist. fragm. (Meissen 1835) p. 117 sqq. Riese's Anth. lat. 482 (II p. 3—5. cf. p. VI). Cf. A. Weichert, de L. Vario etc. p. 157—159. 163 sq. Those fragments actually exhibit a preference for the same caesura as is noticed in the citation in Seneca l. l. The mention of Atropus points to a treatment of the subject similar to the one in the Aeneid (see above 224, n. 5). On the fictitious quotation Rabirius in satyra ap. Fulgent. de abstr. serm. s. v. abstemius see M. Haupt, Rh. Mus. III p. 308 sq.

10. Sen. suas. 6, 27 (p. 38, 8 sqq. Bu.): Sextilius Ena fuit homo ingeniosus magis quam eruditus; inaequalis poeta et plane quibusdam locis talis quales esse Cicero (p. Arch. 10, 26) Cordubenses poetas ait, pingue quiddam sonantes atque peregrinum. is hanc ipsam proscriptionem (of Cicero) recitaturus in domo Messalae Corvini . . in principio hunc versum . . recitavit: deflendus Cicero est etc. From this and the preceding expression 'municipem nostrum' it appears that he was a native of Corduba.

11. Ovid ex Pont. IV 16, 10: et cum subtili Priscus uterque Numa. The connexion of the passage justifies the inference that both Priscus and Numa were also epic poets. They are, however, completely unknown.

12. It is equally obscure to whom Ovid relates ex Pont. IV 16, 23 sq.: quique acies libycas romanaque proelia dixit, et Marius, scripti dexter in omne genus. The first would from this appear to have written a bellum punicum. O. Haube, de carm. ep. (1870) p. 18 sq., understands it of the wars in Africa with Juba and the partisans of Pompey. Pont. IV 16, 33 is quite corrupt: Tityrus antiquas et erat qui pasceret herbas, and H. Wölffel's conjectures (p. 2233 of his translation) are just as little probable as Korn's proposal.

13. Ovid Pont. IV 16, 11 sq.: quique vel imparibus numeris, Montane, vel aequis sufficis et gemino carmine nomen habes. This Montanus, a person equally celebrated in elegy and in epic poetry, is probably the same as Iulius Montanus in Sen. Controv. VII 16, 27 (p. 195 Bu.): Montanus Iulius, qui comis fuit quique egregius poeta; comp. the judgment of his son, the philosopher, Epist. 122, 11: tolerabilis poeta et amicitia Tiberii notus et frigore (W. Teuffel on Hor. Sat. II p. 28). ortus et occasus libentissime inserebat (cf. Apocoloc. 2). He then gives

specimens of his verse (11—13). Donat. vita Vergil. 29 (44): Seneca tradidit Iulium Montanum poetam solitum dicere etc.

14. Fontanus appears to have composed idyls in this time, see above 25, 2.

15. We are not aware in what department of poetry the second son of the orator Messala, Cotta, attempted composition. Cf. Ovid ex Pont. IV 16, 42 (Pieridum lumen) and III 5, 39 (recitas factum modo carmen amicis). cf. ibid. I 5, 57 sq. Merkel's combination (on Trist. IV 4, 55. ad Ibin p. 376) showing that the legend of Orestes formed the subject, rests on the assumption that both Trist. IV 4 (though there v. 5: cuius in ingenio patriae facundiae linguaest, does not quite agree with the relation of Tacitus A. III 34 on his brother) and ex Pont. III 2 are addressed to him.

248. Didactic poetry was in the Augustan period cultivated by Gratius Faliscus, of whose poem on the chase (Cynegetica) we possess the greater part, and especially by Manilius, the author of five books of Astronomica. Though he reminds us of Lucretius in his originality and energy in treating a most difficult subject, and also in his seriousness, thoughtfulness and the unevenness and heaviness of his style, Manilius differs also from him in the superstition he evinces in his subject which is strangely contrasted with the great extent of culture he possesses and his independence of thought, and at the same time he differs from Lucretius in his elaborate knowledge of all technical forms.

1. Ovid ex Pont. IV 16, 34: (cum) aptaque venanti Gratius arma daret, an allusion to Grat. cyneg. 23: carmine et arma dabo venanti et persequar artes armorum. He is not mentioned in any other passage, and the 536 hexameters, of which his poem consists, have been preserved in a Vienna ms. (with occasional lacunae) saec. X (= cod. Sannazarii), together with Ovid's Halieut., Nemesianus and Rutilius Nam., while the Thuaneus (saec. X, at Paris) reaches only to v. 159. In the Vienna ms. there are fragments of five lines after v. 536, but even these are not sufficient to complete the poem. The style of the work is technical, dry, and heavy, and but very rarely rises somewhat higher, e. g. v. 312 sqq. in the rhetorical excursus on the disadvantages of luxury. The episodes 327 sqq. 479 sqq. contain many reminiscences of Virgil. V. 348 (Fatum . . nigris circumvolat alis) reminds the reader of Hor. S. II 1, 58. Ed. princeps (with Halieut., Nemes. and Calpurnius) cura Ge. Logi, Ven. 1534. Then in the Auctores rei venaticae ed. I. Ulitius (Lugd. B. 1645. 1655) and S. Havercamp (Lugd. Bat. 1728. 4.); in vol. I of the poetae latini minores by P. Burmann (Lugd. B. 1731. 4.) and by Wernsdorf (Altenburg 1780), also in Weber's corpus

poetar. lat. p. 595—600. Cum comm. varior. ed. R. Stern, Halle 1832 (with Nemesianus). Ex rec. M. Hauptii, Lips. 1838 (with Halieut., Nemes. and others).

2. The heading of the Astr. in Voss. II: M. Mallii equom (eq. rom.?) astronomicon divo oct. quirino aug.; in Lips., Cusanus, Voss. I a. a.: Arati philosophi astr., for which Vossianus I a m. sec. substitutes M. Manilii. The person of Manilius is completely unknown. That he was not of Roman birth, is rendered probable by the foreign colouring of his diction which in the later books becomes more smooth and fluent from increased practice. His geographical horizon is uncommonly large, cf. e. g. IV 715 sqq. 749 sqq. His acquaintance with Greek literature appears especially from II 1 sqq. III 5 sqq. V 461 sqq. Any connexion with Manilius Antiochus (above 208, 2) is doubtful.

3. Chronological hints. The first book is necessarily written after the battle in the Teutoburg Wood (a. 762), though previous to Augustus' death (a. 767); see I 898 sqq.: ut foedere rupto cum fera ductorem rapuit Germania Varum infecitque trium legionum sanguine campos. 922 sqq.: sed satis hoc (Philippi, Actium, Sex. Pompeius) fatis fuerit. iam bella quiescant. (925 sq.) sit pater invictus patriae, sit Roma sub illo, cumque deum caelum dederit non quaerat in orbe. The end of the fourth book presupposes Augustus as still living; IV 935: maius et Augusto crescet sub principe caelum. Tiberius had, however, already been proclaimed successor, IV 764: est Rhodos hospitium recturi principis orbem. The fifth book which seems to have been added after an interval (V 1 sqq.: hic alius finisset iter, signisque relatis . . non ultra struxisset opus etc. me properare viam mundus iubet) and is without termination, may have been written in the first years of the reign of Tiberius, if indeed V 513 sq. (hinc Pompeia manent veteris monumenta triumphi, non exstincta acie semperque recentia flammis) may be understood of the theatre of Pompey (Tac. A. III 72, cf. Suet. Tib. 47) which was burnt down a. 775 (22 A. D.). Fr. Jacob p. XVI. It is possible that the danger attaching to astrology under Tiberius deterred the poet from finishing his work. Like all Augustan poets, Manilius justifies monarchy by stating the alternative of Octavianus or — Cleopatra (I 914—918). The apotheosis of Augustus I 7 sqq. is quite in keeping with the style of the period: tu, Caesar, patriae princepsque paterque, qui regis augustis parentem legibus orbem concessumque patri mundum deus ipse mereris. I 384 sqq.: cetera (sidera) non cedunt; uno vincuntur in astro Augusto, sidus nostro quod contigit orbi; Caesar nunc terris, post caelo maximus auctor.

4. Manilius takes astronomy in the sense usually attached to it in antiquity as also embracing astrology, and this even preponderates with him. For this very reason it appears credible that his actual knowledge of astronomy was not very extensive. A curious division of signa II 150 sqq. On the difficulty of putting the subject in verse see I 20 sqq. III 26 sqq. He apologizes for using foreign technical expres-

sions: III 40 sqq. He is proud of being the first writer on this subject in Latin literature: I 4 sqq. 113 sq. II 57 sqq. 136 sqq. III 1 sqq. V 1 sqq. He reveals his arrangement of the subject-matter: I 120 sqq. II 750 sqq. IV 119 sqq. He voluntarily resigns all claim to elegance: ne dulcia carmina quaeras. ornari res ipsa negat, contenta doceri (III 28 sq.). But in his excursuses (especially his introductions, also I 884 sqq., and in the fifth book in various descriptions) he furnishes ornament, and whenever he comes to speak of the value of man and of his reason (II 106 sqq. IV 883 sqq.) or of human greediness (IV 1 sqq.), he is eloquent, warm, and pleasing. Fatalism appears from IV 14 sqq.; on the relation of this to free will and human consciousness see IV 108 sqq. (e. g. 117: non refert scelus unde cadit; scelus esse fatendumst). On the sway of ratio in the world I 483 sqq. (against the atomists). II 60 sqq. cf. IV 920 sqq. (932: ratio omnia vincit). An exaggeration of rhetorical details may be noticed in the account of Andromeda and Perseus V 540—619.

5. On the diction of Manilius see Fr. Jacob p. XVIII: linguae legibus eum saepe vim afferre videmus, . . tanta praeterea est orationis inaequalitas ut modo libero volatu sese efferat, modo licenter verbis abundet ac non quid velit dicere, sed quo abripiatur trahi videatur, modo aridissima rerum ieiunitate per inanes artis numeros evagatus nos defatiget, modo constipatis fabularum aenigmatis vix ex miro verborum involucro enucleandis nos exerceat. He is fond of long parenthetic insertions and intricate periods; archaisms (such as itiner, ollis, Nepai, clepere, apisci); Grecisms (especially in the use of the cases and of the infinitive); alliteration, bold metaphors and figures (especially antitheses) abound; see Jacob's index p. 199—225. His metrical and prosodiacal treatment is very correct and strict; see L. Müller, Philol. XV p. 481. 492 and metr. lat. e. g. p. 329. 333. He has occasional reminiscences of Ovid (e. g. III 1), but in general follows Lucretius.

6. All our mss. of Manilius are derived from an archetype which had already been injured. Most of them are of saec. XV, only Gemblacensis (saec. XI), Cusanus and Lipsiensis being somewhat older. The Voss. II is a copy made fram a somewhat more complete copy of the archetype; besides it, the Gemblacensis forms the whole basis of our criticism. The other mss. contain more or less gross mediaeval interpolations, the most glaring instance of which occurs IV 776. Cf. Jacob's praefatio p. V—VI. C. T. Breiter, de emendatione Manilii, Hamm 1854. 24 pp. 4.

7. Ed. princeps at Nürnberg c. 1472. 4.; see C. G. Schwarz, de prima Manilii astr. editione, Altorf 1764. 4. The principal editions are by Jos. Scaliger (Paris 1579. Heidelberg 1590. Leiden 1600. 4.), R. Bentley (London 1739. 4.) and Fr. Jacob (rec., Berlin 1846).

8. Treatises by Fr. Jacob, Posen 1830. 4. (spec. ed.) Lübeck 1832. 4. (de Manilio poeta). 1833. 1835 sq. (de versibus a Bentleio abiudicatis).

9. On Plotius Crispinus, who wrote in verse on the Stoic system, see below 261, 3.

249. In other departments of poetry the declining age of Augustus produced only mediocrities. Such were the erotic elegiac poets Proculus and perhaps Alfius Flavus, the iambic poet Bassus, the lyric poet Rufus, the tragic poets Turranius and Gracchus. Mimi were written by Philistion, a Greek, and probably in Greek.

1. Ovid Pont. IV 16, 32: (cum) Callimachi Proculus molle teneret iter. On Tuscus see above 247, 8 fin.

2. On Alfius Flavus, the author of erotic poems, see below 263, 9.

3. Ovid ex Pont. IV 16, 36: (cum) clauderet imparibus verba Capello modis. Cf. ib. 11 (above 247, 13). It is possible that he also wrote epigrams.

4. The iambographer Bassus, a friend of Ovid's (see above 247, 1) is probably the person addressed by Propertius I 4, 12, and perhaps identical with a rhetorician of this period, Iulius Bassus, homo disertus, cui demptam velles quam consectabatur amaritudinem et simulationem actionis oratoriae (Sen. Controv. X. praef. 12), and who consectari solebat res sordidas et inveniebat qui illas unice suspiceret (ib X 30. p. 303, 23 sqq. Bu.). Lengthy specimens of his lectures ib. I 6, 2—6. 7, 8 sq.

5. Ovid Pont. IV 16, 28: Pindaricae fidicen tu quoque, Rufe, lyrae. It is not very probable that he is the same Rufus who is addressed ib. II 11 and who had an estate at Fundi, considering that he is not praised for writing poetry; nor is he the same as Valgius Rufus (above 236); he might rather be Antonius Rufus, if Glandorp's statement that he teste Acrone vertit Homerum et Pindarum, did not rest on an erroneous combination (cf. Wernsdorf poet. lat. min. III p. XXX sq.). Acro on Hor. A. p. 288 says only: praetextas et togatas scripserunt Aelius Lamia, Antonius Rufus, Gn. Melissus etc. A grammarian Antonius Rufus is mentioned by Quintil. I 5, 43, cf. Vel. Long. de orthogr. p. 2237 P.

6. Ovid Pont. IV 16, 29: Muraque Turrani tragicis innixa cothurnis. The supposed Apulejus (de orthograph.) pretends to know that he had written a tragedy on the subject of Helena.

7. Ovid Pont. IV 16, 31: cum Varius (above 219, 2) Gracchusque darent fera dicta tyrannis. This association of itself renders it probable that Gracchus also wrote a Thyestes; besides which also Priscian VI p. 719 P. = 269, 8 sq. Htz. quotes a senarius from Gracchus in Thyeste. This as well as the one quoted from Gracchus in Atalanta (ib. p. 683 P. = 206 Htz.) are in conformity with Greek strictness. An anapaestic dimeter from Graius in Peliadibus ap. Non. p. 202, 20.

Welcker on Greek tragedies p. 1431. Trag. lat. ed. Ribb. (I) p. 196. He is probably identical with Sempronius Gracchus familia nobili, sollers ingenio et prave facundus whom Tiberius had killed a. 767 on account of his former connexion with Julia, the daughter of Augustus, after he had already spent 14 years in exile on the island of Cercina (Tac. A. I 53, cf. Vell. II 100, 5). If so, Ovid would seem to have mentioned two dead characters together.

8. Jerome on Eus. chron. ad a. Abr. 2023 (in the cod. Petav. on 2022) = 50 Aug. = 761 v. c.: Philistio mimographus natione Magnes Asianus (according to Suidas from Nicaea or Prusa) Romae clarus habetur. But as neither Ovid mentions him among the poets of his time, nor ever a passage is quoted from him in Latin, but various titles in Greek (*Μιμοψηφιστραί, Φιλόγελως*, etc. in Suidas), he possibly belongs to Greek literature. He was perhaps assisted by the Tarentine Crassicius as an interpreter (circa scenam versatus est dum mimographos adiuvat, Suet. gramm. 18); and he may also be identical with the jocular Philistus (Augusto familiaris, orator et poesin mediocriter doctus) who is mentioned in a passage of Donatus' vita Vergilii (p. 18, 77, in Reifferscheid's Suetonius p. 67 sq.), which is, however, omitted in the cod. Bernensis.

III. Prose-writers.

250. Among the prose-writers of the Augustan age the historians occupy the first place. The oldest of them, such men as Octavius (Musa), seem to have dealt with the whole of Roman history in the early manner. But by far a greater number devote their attention to the celebrities of the late Wars, generally with an apologetic purpose. Thus Volumnius and Bibulus wrote on M. Brutus, Q. Dellius on M. Antony, Tiro on Cicero; and also the authors of Memoirs on their own share in politics, such as were composed by Augustus, Agrippa, and M. Messala, pursued the same end. Asinius Pollio started a large work on the whole time of the Civil Wars, but soon found that his time was not favourable to candid relations of recent events. On the other hand, Cincius began to write Roman history in a manner favourable to the interests of the reigning family.

1. Ps. Vergil. Catal. 14, 1: quis deus, Octavi, te nobis abstulit? 5 sq.: scripta quidem tua nos multum mirabimur et te raptum et romanam flebimus historiam. He is probably meant by Horace S. I 10, 82 where he mentions Octavius, and is identical with Musa in Verg. Cat. 13 (cf. 10), hence also the same as Octavius Musa in Serv. Verg. Ecl.

9, 7 and Schol. Bern. Ecl. 8, 6. But it is doubtful whether he is the same as Octavius venerandus puer addressed in the Culex (above 225, 1). Ribbeck, Appendix Verg. p. 8—10.

2. On the historical work of Q. Tubero see above 205, 1.

3. Plut. Brut. 48: *Πόπλιος Βολούμνιος, ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος καὶ συνεστρατευμένος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς Βρούτῳ, . . λέγει.* ib. 51: *δύο στίχους, ὧν τὸν ἕτερον Βολούμνιος ἀνέγραψε* etc. Also Appianus' account (b. c. IV 112—135) seems in parts to be derived from this source (and from Messala, see above 218, 10): H. Peter, on the sources of Plutarch, p. 137—139.

4. L. Calpurnius Bibulus, the only son whom Porcia brought from her first marriage to her second with M. Brutus, after the two elder sons had been killed a. 704. He served under his step-father at Philippi, was taken prisoner by M. Antony, entered his service and fell as his lieutenant in Syria (W. Drumann Hist. of Rome II p. 105 sq. nr. 41); *καί τι βιβλίδιον μικρὸν ἀπομνημονευμάτων Βρούτου, γεγραμμένον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, διασώζεται,* Plut. Brut. 13. cf. ib. 23: *ταῦτα ὁ τῆς Πορκίας υἱὸς ἱστόρηκε Βύβλος.* H. Peter l. l. p. 139 sq.

5. Strab. XI 13, 3. p. 523 C.: *ὡς φησιν ὁ Δέλλιος ὁ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου φίλος, συγγράψας* (probably in Greek) *τὴν ἐπὶ Παρθυαίους αὐτοῦ στρατείαν, ἐν ᾗ παρῆν καὶ αὐτὸς ἡγεμονίαν ἔχων.* Plut. Anton. 59: *πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φίλων οὐ Κλεοπάτρας κόλακες ἐξέβαλον, . . ὧν καὶ Μάρκος ἦν Σιλανὸς καὶ Δέλλιος ὁ ἱστορικός. οὗτος δὲ . . φησὶν* etc. Sen. suas. I 8: bellissimum rem Deillius dixit quem Messala Corvinus desultorem bellorum civilium vocat, quia ab Dolabella ad Cassium transiturus salutem sibi pactus est si Dolabellam occidisset, a Cassio deinde transiit ad Antonium, novissime ab Antonio transfugit ad Caesarem. hic est Deillius cuius epistolae ad Cleopatram lascivae feruntur. Cf. Hor. O. II 3.

6. For Tiro's work on Cicero see above 178, 2; for Munatius Rufus on Cato Minor 212, 2.

7. Autobiographies (Memoirs) by Augustus, see above 217, 3 sq., Agrippa (above 217, 13), M. Messala (above 218, 10).

8. On Asinius Pollio's History of the Civil Wars see above 218, 3. On the historical work of the rhetorician Seneca see below 264, 3.

9. On Cincius see above 106, 4. To show that he wrote in favour of the reigning family, Plüss (de Cinciis p. 38 sqq. and New Swiss Museum VI 1866. p. 45 sqq.) alleges that he placed the foundation of Rome a. 729 b. Chr., i. e. commenced a new century with 729, and agreed with Virgil in the new pedigree of the Iulii and in identifying the Latins and Romans.

251. The most important prose-writer of the Augustan period is T. Livius of Patavium (a. 695—770), a man of

rhetorical training and who spent the greater part of his life at Rome, far from political life, though on friendly terms with Augustus. He wrote several philosophical works of popular tendency, mostly in the shape of dialogues, a work on rhetorical training addressed to his son, in epistolary form, but especially a comprehensive account of the whole history of Rome from the foundation of the City until the death of Drusus (a. 745) in 142 books, of which, however, only 35 have come down to us, being the first decade and book XXI to XLV. The *Periochae* which we possess of almost all books form but an unsatisfactory substitute for the loss of the rest.

1. General literature on Livy. L. Preller in Pauly's Encycl. IV p. 1120—1128. C. J. Grysar's praef. to his edition of the part. sel. Liv. I (Vienna 1854 and 1857). W. Weissenborn's introduction to his edition with German notes, and Prolegg. (CXXXV pp.) before the second edition of his text (Teubner 1860.). M. Hertz (Prolusio, XLV pp.) before his text (1857). L. E. Kähler, de T. L. vita ac moribus, Berlin 1851. 31 pp. 8. M. Weingärtner, de T. L. vita part. I. Berlin 1852. 55 pp. 8.

2. Hieronym. on Eus. chron. a. Abr. 1958 = 695 v. c.: Messala Corvinus orator nascitur et T. Livius Patavinus scriptor historicus; and of Abr. 2033 = 770 v. c.: Livius historiographus Patavi moritur. His birth at Padua is confirmed by the charge of Patavinitas (below 253, 14) and by Martial I 61, 3 (censetur Apona Livio suo tellus) and Stat. Silv. IV 7, 55 sq. (Timavi alumnum), also Plut. Caes. 47 (*ἐν Πατα βίῳ Γάϊος Κορνήλιος, . . Λιβίου τοῦ συγγραφέως πολίτης καὶ γνώριμος*).

3. Liv. IV 20, 7: hoc ego cum Augustum Caesarem (see n. 5) . . se ipsum . . legisse audissem. Tac. A. IV 34: T. Livius . . Cn. Pompeium tantis laudibus tulit ut Pompeianum eum Augustus appellaret; neque id amicitiae eorum offecit. Scipionem, Afranium, hunc ipsum Cassium, hunc Brutum nusquam latrones et parricidas, quae nunc vocabula imponuntur, saepe ut insignes viros nominat. Cf. Sen. nat. quaest. V 18, 4: quod de Caesare maiore volgo dictatum est et a T. Livio positum, in incerto esse utrum illum nasci magis reip. profuerit an non nasci. Suet. Claud. 41: historiam in adulescentia hortante T. Livio . . scribere adgressus est (Claudius, born c. 744 v. c.). G. Schwab, de Livio et Timagene hist. script. aemulis, Stuttgart 1834. 4.

4. Sen. Epist. 100, 9: nomina adhuc (as a philosophical writer) T. Livium. scripsit enim et dialogos, quos non magis philosophiae adnumerare possis quam historiae, et ex professo philosophiam continentes libros. In the sequel he is associated with Cicero and Asinius Pollio (tribus eloquentissimis). Quintil. X 1, 39: apud Livium in epistola ad filium scripta, legendos Demosthenem atque Ciceronem, tum

ita ut quisque Demostheni et Ciceroni simillimus. Cf. ib. II 5, 20 (quemadmodum Livius praecipit). Hence probably also ib. VIII 2, 18 (cum iam apud T. Livium inveniam fuisse praeceptorem aliquem qui discipulos obscurare quae dicerent iuberet), and the quotations of Seneca the Elder, controv. IX 24, 14. p. 249 cf. p. 433 sq. Bu. (on Sallust, see above 204, 7) and 25, 26 (p. 259 Bu.). Peculiar statements by Suidas v. *Κορνοῦτος* (II p. 346 sq. Bnh.): *δύω συγγραφέε Ῥωμαίων ἤστην, Τῖτος Λίβιος, οὗ διαῤῥεῖ πολὺ καὶ κλεινὸν ὄνομα, καὶ Κορνοῦτος,* the latter of whom, being childless and rich, attracted a great crowd *τῶν ἀκροωμένων. ὁ χρόνος δὲ . . καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια . . τὸν μὲν ἀνέφηναν . . ὥσπερ κεκρυμμένον θησαυρόν, τοῦτον τὸν Λίβιον* etc.

5. Livy commenced his history between a. 727 and 729, as I 19, 3 (see n. 3) he mentions Augustus, but seems unaware of the second closing of the temple of Janus by him (a. 729). The latest event which can be shown to have been mentioned by Livy is Drusus' death and burial in the winter of 745/6; it is, however, a very probable conjecture that Livy intended continuing his work down to the death of Augustus (767) and perhaps completing the number of 150 books. The single portions (decades?) were, as it seems, separately published by the author under special titles; thus book 71—80 contained the Social War, and books 109—116 in the cod. Nazar. of the periochae bear the title of Bellum Civile. See also Suid. l. l. (n. 4), Pliny praef. 16 (n. 6.). The periocha libri CXXI in the cod. Naz. is headed: ex lib. CXXI, qui additus post excessum Augusti dicitur. It would seem that originally Livy had divided his work into decades and semi-decades and published it accordingly (E. Wölfflin, on the crit. of Livy, p. 30), but gradually changed this (cf. the Bellum civile book 109 sqq.). Yet this division became subsequently the rule followed in copying the work. The earliest mention of this division known to us occurs in a letter of Pope Gelasius of a. 492—496; though Victorianus' recension (n. 10) proves it to be older. See also Liv. X 31, 10: Samnitium bella, quae continua per quartum iam volumen . . agimus. VI 1, 1: quinque libris exposui.

6. Liv. XLIII 13, 2: ea pro indignis habere quae in meos annales referam. Plin. N. H. praef. 16: profiteor mirari T. Livium, auctorem celeberrimum, in historiarum suarum, quas repetit ab origine urbis, quodam volumine sic orsum. According to the Verona Palimpsest and other old mss. of Livy and the periochae, the real title is ab urbe condita libri; cf. Liv. VI 1, 1: quae ab condita urbe Roma ad captam . . Romani . . gessere etc.

7. Estimation by the writer's contemporaries. Sen. Controv. X, praef. 2 (p. 290 sq. Bu.): L. Magius, gener T. Livi, . . cum illum homines non in ipsius honorem laudarent, sed in soceri ferrent. Plin. Epist. II 3, 8: nunquamne legisti Gaditanum quendam Titi Livi nomine gloriaque commotum ad visendum eum ab ultimo terrarum orbe venisse statimque ut viderat abisse? Cf. Hieronym. Epist. 53. In the later time

of the Imperial period Livy became the almost exclusive source, in an abridgment in which the names of the consuls were prefixed in the ablative year by year; Mommsen, on Cassiodorus p. 551 sq. See above p. 47.

8. The extant books (those of the fifth decade having several gaps) treat of Roman history from the foundation of the City until a. 461 (first decade), and from the beginning of the second Punic war (a. 536) until the triumph of Aemilius Paulus over Macedonia (a. 587). The scanty fragments of the other books may be seen in the editions, e. g. in M. Hertz, vol. IV p. 224—235. Cf. M. Hertz, de fragmentis T. Livii commentatio. Part. I and II. Breslau 1864. 4. The loss of by far the greatest part was no doubt caused by the great extent of the whole work (Martial XIV 190). Cf. van Heusde, Verslagen etc. V 4. p. 374—387.

9. Of the periochae those of book 136 and 137 have been accidentally lost. Their author is unknown, though they are generally attributed to Florus owing to the fact of their being commonly found in the mss. of that writer's work. An edition of them by O. Jahn (rec. et emend.), Lips. 1853. Conjectures on them by C. Halm, in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 81, p. 507—509. E. v. Leutsch, Exercitationes criticae, Göttingen 1859. 4. A contribution to b. XX in Hermes IV p. 471—476.

10. The mss. of the first decade bear various subscriptions. At the end of all books of it we read: Victorianus V. C. emendabam domnis Symmachis; together with this we find at the end of b. VI, VII and VIII: Nicomachus Flavianus V. C. III praefect. urbis emendavi apud Hennam, after b. III, IV and V: Nicomachus Dexter V. C. emendavi ad exemplum parentis mei Clementiani. It would hence seem to result that Victorianus emended the whole decade, but the two Nicomachi only several books each. O. Jahn, Reports of the Saxon Society of Letters, 1851, p. 335—338.

11. In the first decade we possess about thirty mss. The earliest of them is the palimpsest in the chapter-library at Verona, containing b. 3—6, first published by Fr. Blume in Niebuhr's Rh. Mus. II (1828) p. 336—343. Cf. A. W. Zumpt, de Livianorum librorum inscriptione et codice antiquissimo Veronensi, Berlin 1859. 39 pp. 4. Th. Mommsen, T. Livii ab u. c. libr. III—VI quae supersunt in codice rescripto Veronensi descr. et ed., Transactions of the Berlin Academy 1868. 185 pp. 4. According to Mommsen, the palimpsest is not derived from the archetype of the libri Nicomach., but shares with them one and the same original archetype. The Nicomachean recension is best represented by the (now lost) cod. Vormaciensis and its equal, the Medicean codex saec. XI (bibl. Flor. Laur. plut. LXII 19), which is now the chief foundation of our criticism. Next to this comes the Parisinus 5725 (formerly Colbert.), derived from a somewhat earlier copy of the same archetype. Both these mss. were first used by Alschefski. See

his treatise on the critical treatment of the historical work of Livy, Berlin 1839. 4. and the preface to his introduction. To this may be added the cod. Bamberg. (Heerwagen, Excerpta e cod. Bamb. ad Liv. libr. I, Baireuth 1856. 4.) and Einsiedl. saec. X (Orelli in Seebode's New Annals I. 1831. p. 396 sqq.). Related to these mss. are Helmstad. I, Harlei. I (b. 1—8), Leidens. I, Voss. I, Florent. (in the library of St. Mark's), which agrees very closely with the Veronens. sec. (saec. XIII), described by J. Schlenger in the Mayence Programm 1868. (26 pp. 4.). The other mss. of this class are of no value. A list of the mss. in Drakenborch's edition XV 1 p. 613 sqq. A critical review by Heerwagen, Munich Gel. Anz. XIX, nr. 139, p. 29—31.

The third decade has come down to us in a satisfactory text, relatively speaking, in Paris. 5730 (Puteaneus), saec. VIII (in uncial writing), which has, however, gaps at beginning and end; next to this Medic. Laur. LXIII 20 and Paris. 5731 (Colbert.), and Bamberg. (J. Meyer, Nuremberg 1847 sq. Progr.). The Spirensis, used by Rhenanus, but afterwards lost, is derived from a source different from the Put. See H. Perthes, Quaest. Liv., Bonn 1863. J. Hasenmüller, Rhein. Mus. XIX p. 314—317. H. W. Heerwagen, comm. critica de Liv. XXVI 41, 18—44, 1. Nuremberg 1869. 20 pp. 4.

The text of the fourth decade rests on Bamberg. (which alone contains XXXIII 1—17) and the now lost Moguntinus. L. Urlichs, the Bamberg mss. of Livy, Eos I (1864) p. 84—91. W. Weissenborn, de codice Livii Moguntino, Eisenach 1865. 4. L. Kühnast (below 241, 11) III p. 22. On a (worthless) late Liegnitz ms. see H. Kraffert in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 103 p. 69—75, and R. Peiper ibid. p. 211—216.

What we possess of the fifth decade, rests on cod. Laurishamiensis (of the Benedictine monastery at Lorsch), now Vindobonensis, saec. VI. Cf. Lambecius ap. Drakenborch XV p. 428 sqq. Kreyssig, annotationes ad Liv. XLI—XLV ex cod. Vindob. I. Meissen 1849. 4. Madvig, de Liv. libr. XLIII initio e cod. Vindob. emendando, Copenhagen 1852. 4. J. Vahlen in the Journal for Austrian Colleges *1861, p. 5—19. 249—266. 1866, p. 307—309.* W. *Hartel, ibid. 1866, p. 1—20.*

12. Complete editions. *Cf. Drakenborch XV 1. p. 628—652. Fabricius* bibl. lat. I. p. 279 sqq. Schweiger, *Classical Bibliography II* 1. p. 524 sqq. and others. Ed. princeps Rom c. 1469 fol. cura Io. Aleriensis (without b. 33 and 41—45), supplemented (from the cod. Mogunt.) in the edition at Mayence 1519 (fol.) and further increased (from cod. Laurisham.) by S. Grynaeus (Basel 1531. fol.); finally (from cod. Bamb.) a. 1616 sq. especially by J. Horrio. Important on account of the employment of good mss. is the edition of B. Rhenanus and S. Gelenius, Basle 1535. fol. Cum scholiis C. Sigonii, Venet. 1555. fol. The first critical edition ex rec. I. Fr. Gronovii, Lugd. Bat. 1645. 1679. 3 vols. A great accumulation of materials by A. Drakenborch (cum comm. Dukeri et variorum), Amsterd. 1738—1746, 7 vols. 4.; Stuttgart reprint 1820—1828, 15 vols. 8. This edition contains also the unnecessary

supplementa librorum deperditorum by J. Freinsheim (originally printed with those of Crevier, Paris 1679). Editions of the text in the Mannheim and Bipont collection, by A. G. Ernesti (with a glossary Lips. 1769. 3 vols.; 4. by Kreyssig, Lips. 1823—1827, 5 vols.), L. Tafel (Stuttgart 1824 sq. 3 vols.) and Kreyssig (Lips. 1828. 4.). A small edition by A. F. Stroth and F. W. Döring (Lips. 1780—1784. 3 vols.; Gotha 1796—1819), G. A. Ruperti (Götting. 1807—1809, 6 vols.), I. Bekker and Raschig (Berlin 1829 sq., 3 vols.). Critical editions by C. F. S. Alschefski (ad fidem codd. em., Berlin 1841—1846, 3 vols., only as far as b. XXIII incl.; the text 4 vols., as for as b. XXX, Berl. 1843 sq.), N. Madvig and J. L. Ussing (Copenhagen 1861 sqq.). Texts with critical prefaces by W. Weissenborn (Lips. Teubner 1850 sq.; iterum recogn. 1860 sqq. 6 vols.) and M. Hertz (Lips. Tauchn. 1857—1864, 4 vols.). With (German) explanatory notes by G. Chr. Crusius (Hannover 1846 sqq.) and G. Mühlmann (Hannover 1854 sqq.), especially by W. Weissenborn (Leipzig and Berlin, ap. Weidmann 1853 sqq. 10 vols., vol. I in fourth ed.), and J. Frey (Leipzig, Teubner 1865 sqq., two parts published).

13. Editions of single books or portions. Books XXXI and XXII with notes by E. W. Fabri (Nürnberg 1837; a new edition by H. W. Heerwagen, Nürnberg 1852). Lib. XXIII et XXIV recogn. et comm. instr. E. W. Fabri, Nürnberg 1840. Lib. XXX ad codd. fidem emend. ed. C. F. S. Alschefski, Berl. 1839. Lib. XXXIII emend. ed. illustr. Fr. Göller, Frankf. 1822; denuo rec. J. G. Kreyssig. Acc. var. lect. in libris XXX—XXXVIII ex cod. Bamberg., Meissen 1837. 1839.

14. Contributions to the criticism of the text. Emendationes Livianae by G. L. Walch (Berlin 1815), E. W. Fabri (Nürnberg 1842), E. Welz (Breslau 1844), H. A. Koch (Brandenburg 1860 sq. 4.), H. Alanus (Dublin 1864. 1867) and especially by J. N. Madvig (Copenhagen 1860. 638 pp. Cf. G. Queck, de Madv. em. Liv. libr. I—III. Sondershausen 1861. 4.). Emendatiunculae by Wesenberg in Tidskr. f. philol. IX 1. 1870.) Observationes Livianae by H. Wimmer (Dresden 1839), Ch. W. Fittbogen (Frankf. a. O. 1842), J. Freudenberg (Bonn 1854 and 1862. 4.), A. Giers (Bonn 1862), H. Wachendorf (Bonn 1864). Lectiones Livianae by A. Linsmayer (München 1864); Commentationes by Fischer (Speier 1840. 4.); Quaestiones Liv. by F. Bessler (Salzwedel 1847. 4.), H. Perthes (Bonn 1863), Quaestiunculae by F. Sartorius (Baireuth 1860. 4.). E. Wölfflin, on the criticism and style of Livy, Berlin 1864. 31 pp. 4. (especially on b. XXII); Boot in the Verslagen en mededeelingen IX, 1865 (on b. 21); M. Müller (Contributions to the criticism and explanation of Livy, Stendal. 1866. 1871. 4. Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 99 p. 339—354), and others.

252. In the historical work of Livy we meet with many shortcomings. The author has not troubled himself with laborious investigation of the sources nor visited the scenes of the

events related by him, but has generally contented himself with rendering the relations of his predecessors, especially Polybius and the later Roman Annalists, in an improved and elegant style. He also lacks sufficient knowledge of political law and most of all of military art and discipline, nay, he even writes without a settled system of chronology. But these numerous faults are compensated by one great virtue, his unquestionable intention of stating the truth, which he never violates or withholds against his better knowledge; yet even the most flagrant crimes of history are seen through a conciliating veil owing to the author's irresistible amiability. His mild nature recoils from harshness and sympathizes with the oppressed and vanquished; the nervous characters of the ancient history of Rome are worshipped by him with enthusiastic fondness. This warm sympathy and his extensive talent of historical description make him as great a historical writer as he is insignificant as a historical critic. His strength lies in the relation of events, moods and characters. He is fond of giving descriptive sketches of his characters by attributing speeches to them in which the writer's rhetorical training appears to the greatest advantage. On the whole, Livy interests his readers more by his rhetorical style and by entertaining their imagination, than by endeavouring to ascertain historical truth. Livy's diction lacks severe classicality and even polish in details, but is lively, elegant and adapted to every situation with unerring tact.

1. Personal confessions of Livy. Praef. 5: ego hoc quoque laboris praemium petam ut me a conspectu malorum quae nostra tot per annos vidit aetas tantisper certe dum prisca illa tota mente repeto avertam, omnis expers curae quae scribentis animum etsi non flectere a vero, sollicitum tamen efficere posset. XLIII 13, 2: et mihi vetustas res scribenti nescio quo pacto anticus fit animus et quaedam religio tenet quae illi prudentissimi viri publice suscipienda censuerint (miracles and prodigies), ea pro indignis habere quae in meos annales referam.

2. Judgments of antiquity. Sen. suas. 6, 21 sq. (p. 35 Bu.): quotiens magni alicuius viri mors ab historicis narrata est, toties fere consummatio totius vitae et quasi funebris laudatio redditur. hoc. . . T. Livius benignius omnibus magnis viris reddidit. . . ut est natura candidissimus omnium magnorum ingeniorum aestimator T. Livius. Sen. de ira I 20, 6: apud disertissimum virum Livium. Tac. Agr. 10: Livius veterum, Fabius Rusticus recentium eloquentissimi auctores. Ann. IV 34: T. Livius, eloquentiae ac fidei praeclarus inprimis. Quintil.

VIII 1, 3: in T. Livio, mirae facundiae viro. A very happy criticism ib. X 1, 101: neque indignetur sibi Herodotus aequari T. Livium, cum in narrando mirae iucunditatis clarissimique candoris tum in contionibus supra quam enarrari potest eloquentem; ita quae dicuntur omnia cum rebus tum personis accommodata sunt. affectus quidem praecipueque eos qui sunt dulciores, ut parcissime dicam, nemo historicorum commendavit magis. Ib. 32: neque illa Livii lactea ubertas. II 5, 19: ego candidissimum quemque (writer) et maxime expositum velim, ut Livium a pueris magis quam Sallustium. But Caligula (Suet. Cal. 34) ut verbosum in historia neglegentemque carpebat (T. Livium).

3. Modern opinions on Livy as historian. Niebuhr, Roman Hist. I p. 3—5. II p. 609 sq.; Lectures on Roman History I p. 45—58; and other writers on (early) Roman history, e. g. Wachsmuth (p. 32—43), Blume (p. 123 sqq. 146 sq.), Schwegler (I p. 103—115. II p. 10—13), C. G. Lewis (On the credibility of early Roman history). J. M. Sölti, On Livy's character in his history, München 1832. 4. H. Ulrici, Characteristics of ancient historical composition, p. 120—125. F. D. Gerlach, the Historians of the Romans, p. 133—143. Kallenbach, on Livy's relation to his work and time, Quedlinburg 1860. 43 pp. 4. Th. Mommsen, Hermes V p. 270—280, and others.

4. On the political views of Livy we have a program by Fr. X. Frühe, Constanz 1851. Livy has no definite political system, which would not agree with his romantic and ideal nature. Nor does his mild temper admit of party-hatred. But he has his strong antipathies. All violence, rant, zelotism, and harshness are disagreeable to him, wherever he may meet with them; hence he dislikes App. Claudius as much as C. Terentius Varro, C. Flaminius as much the impatient tribunes of the people; even Scipio the Elder is not quite to his mind. His admiration is most sincere for Romans of the old style such as Cincinnatus, Papirius Cursor, Camillus, Sex. Tempanius, P. Decius, Fabius Cunctator; in a case of party-strife he is always on the side of moderation and reconciliation. He is most averse to the mob, which he frequently lashes for its want of sense and honour, and for its licentiousness (e. g. XXIII 2. XXIV 25, 8. XXXI 34. 44). But in ancient Rome he sees his ideal realised, and *romanus* hence signifies in his language all that is noble (e. g. I 53, 4. V 28, 3. 36, 1. 38, 5. XXII 57, 6. XXV 36 extr. Cf. above 1, 1). He thus involuntarily appears partial in favour of Rome, and unjust to her enemies; see Weissenborn's Introd. p. 32 sq. Compared with that beautiful time, his own period appears to him depraved, and many times he mourns the loss of ancient pudor, simplicitas, modestia, aequitas, altitudo animi and especially of pietas. On the other hand, neglegentia deum, omnis divini humanique moris characterizes the time in his eyes. This sentimental mode of viewing things renders him not only eloquent, but also courageous; cf. VII 40, 2: nondum erant tam fortes ad sanguinem civilem, nec praeter externa noverant bella, ultimaque rabies secessio ab suis habebatur.

5. Livy's piety is altogether of a pantheistic colouring. Man, conscious of his littleness and weakness, must be meek, watch the manifestations of divine sway, honour the deity and beware of ever sinning against it. Hence arises also Livy's fatalism which is chiefly conspicuous in the first decade, in the absence of a clear perception of a sensible connexion of things. E. g. I 42, 2: nec rupit tamen fati necessitatem humanis consiliis. V 37, 1: adeo obcaecat animos fortuna, ubi vim suam ingruentem refringi non volt. VIII 24, 4: ut ferme fugiendo in media fata ruitur. XXV 6, 4: nulla providentia fatum imminens moveri potuit. Another passage is somewhat rationalistic, VIII 7, 8: movet ferocem animum iuvenis seu ira seu . . pudor seu inexsuperabilis vis fati. Cf. III 8, 1. Here we should also mention his belief in miracles; cf. XXVII 23, 6: in capita consulum, rep. incolumi exitiabilis prodigiorum eventus vertit. XLIII 13, 1: non sum nescius ab eadem neglegentia qua nihil deos portendere volgo nunc credant neque nuntiari admodum ulla prodigia in publicum neque in annales referri. Some limitations III 5, 14. V 21, 9. XXIV 4, 8. 10, 6. XXVII 23, 3. — Queck, Contributions to the characteristic of Livy, I. Sondershausen 1847. 4. O. Fabricius, on the religious views of Livy, Königsberg 1865. 35 pp. 4.

6. Limitation of his historical subject-matter. XXXIII 20 extr.: non operae est persequi ut quaeque acta in his locis sint, cum ad ea quae propria romani belli sunt vix sufficiam. In nearly the same words he says XLI 25 extr. XXXIX 48, 6: cuius belli et causas et ordinem si expromere velim immemor sim propositi, quo statui non ultra attingere externa nisi qua romanis cohaerent rebus. Cf. VIII 24, 18. XXIX 29, 5 (excedere paululum). XXXV 40, 1.

7. The aesthetical views Livy takes of his subject-matter are characterized by his repeated expressions piget scribere, enumerare etc. (e. g. X 18, 7. 31, 15. XXVI 49), also by such expressions as XXVII 37 (above 82, 6.) Of the two motives distinguished by him praef. 2 (dum novi semper scriptores aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos credunt) he has certainly been influenced by the second.

8. As regards his predecessors, Livy has neither known nor employed them all from the beginning of his works, but only gradually his horizon began to enlarge. He did not use Cato's Origines before the fourth decade, and Polybius not before b. XXIII. Of the better authorities in Latin literature on early history he probably did not avail himself of a single one, neither of Fabius Pictor nor of Piso, but contented himself with comparing the writers of a later time, especially Antias, Macer, and Tubero. Not until he had trusted Valerius Antias for a considerable time, did he begin to estimate him more justly: see above 142, 3. From his cool expression XXX 45 (haud spernendus auctor) it might even appear that he was not aware of the real value of Polybius, if it were not certain that he translates him almost verbally (though sometimes he abridges and then again enlarges upon

him) in his account of the war with Philip III and Antiochus. He has neither used Dionysius of Halicarnassus nor was he used by him. F. Lachmann, de fontibus historiarum T. Livii comm. I. II. Gotting. 1821 sq. 4. C. Peter, on the mutual relations of Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus and their treatment of the early annalists, Anclam 1853. 13 p. 4. L. Kieserling (see above 32, 4). H. Nissen, Critical Investigations on the sources of the fourth and fifth decades of L., Berlin 1863. 342 p. Th. Lucas, disp. de ratione qua Livius in libris hist. conscribendis usus est opere Polybiano, I. Glogau 1854. 18 pp. 4. W. Michael, how far did Livy follow Polybius as his chief authority? Torgau 1859. 16 pp. 4. L. Tillmanns, qua ratione L. (in b. 31—45) Polybii historiis usus sit, Part. I. Bonn 1860. 60 pp., and Quo libro Liv. Polybii hist. uti coeperit, in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 83, p. 844—854. C. Peter, Livy and Polybius; on the sources of b. XXI and XXII in Livy, Halle 1863. 4. C. Böttcher, quaestiones criticae de T. Livii l. XXI et XXII fontibus, Königsberg 1867. 39 pp. W. Michael, de ratione qua L. in tertia decade opere Polyb. usus sit, Bonn 1867. K. W. Nitzsch, Analysis of the sources of Livy II 1 — IV 8 and Dionys. Hal. V 1 — XI 63, Rhein. Mus. XXIII p. 600—631. XXIV p. 145—180. Also H. Müller, on the battle on the Trebia, Berlin 1867. 34 pp. 4. Fr. Friedersdorff, Livius et Polybius Scipionis rerum scriptores, Gotting. 1869. 70 pp. H. Peter, hist. I p. LXXXIX—XCIII. CXCVIII—CC. CCXXV —CCXXX. CCCXIII sq. CCCXLVII—CCCL.

9. On Livy's notions of historical criticism. Whenever his predecessors agree, a matter must be very improbable of itself (cf. V 21, 8 sq. VI 12, 2 sqq.), if Livy is to doubt it. Things agreed upon by his sources he generally considers true, and thus only renders the ordinary tradition. If his predecessors disagree, he frequently abstains from deciding himself, or pronounces in favour of the majority or of the earliest and least suspected witness, sometimes also in favour of the more plausible account, or even of the one more favourable to the Romans (e. g. VII 27, 9. X 39) or the mildest (e. g. IV 29, 6. VI 28, 10. VIII 10, 2) or the most impressive (e. g. VII 39 sqq. X 37. XXI 46, 10. XXVI 15) or merely adopts a mediating account (e. g. XXVI 49, 6). Especially in the earlier period his judgment frequently wavers; cf. V 21, 9: in rebus tam antiquis si quae similia veri sint pro veris accipiantur satis habeam. In this part he frequently pronounces himself incompetent to decide. But elsewhere also he is fond of choosing this solution, partly from a want of the proper study of his sources or owing to his shallow estimation of the controverted points. This is carried so far that he does not even profit by some very disagreeable lessons. Though his experience with Valerius Antias ought to have taught him to beware of high numbers in the accounts of battles, he still does not hesitate in stating about 54000 killed XXXVII 44, and even 56000 XXVII 49. As concerns his modesty, we may refer e. g. to XXIX 14, 9: id .. sicut proditum a proximis memoriae temporum illorum scriptoribus libens posteris traderem, ita meas opiniones coniectando rem vetustate obrutam non interponan.

10. His dependence on his authorities and a certain inadvertence (which may be easily explained in so extensive a work), partly also the successive elaboration and publication of detached pieces, have caused many errors in details, repetitions, contradictions, omissions, mistakes, erroneous translations, etc. Instances are given in Weissenborn's introduction p. 28 sq. In consequence of all this, Livy as a historical authority should be used, especially on the earliest time, only with much caution, though his personal intention to state the truth cannot be questioned. Treatises de fide Livii (omitting those which are antiquated) by C. Kruse (I et II, Lips. 1812. 4.) and Bäumker (Liv. antiquiss. rerum rom. hist. etc., Paderborn 1863. 4.). In spite of this, his work was in the following centuries used without any critical caution, it was copied and abridged; see above 251, 7 and U. Köhler, qua ratione T. Livii annalibus usi sint historici latini atque graeci, Gotting. 1861. 99 pp. 4.

11. The general plan of Livy's work resembles the work of the early Annalists not only in relating the events year by year, but also in being much shorter in the earliest time and expanding the more it approaches the better-known period; cf. above 32 and 105, 1. The first sixty books contained the history of six centuries, the latter 80 about 120 years. The first third of b. I is very shallow and (like the beginning of the second book) an unsuccessful attempt at a pragmatical account of the motives of events supposed to be historical. But in these vague figures Livy's general method could not succeed, we mean his detailed accounts of psychological motives. Just as he describes moods (e. g. VIII 7, 20 sq. IX 2, 10 sq. 5 sq. XXXIII 32) he also knows how to bring out external events very vividly (e. g. V 39 sqq. XXI 58. XXIII 27, 6 sq. XXIV 26). This quality as well as his humane mild judgment render Livy especially attractive to young readers. But in proportion as historical statements succeed to legend or fiction, and deprive the writer of the chance of displaying his imagination, the more decreases the charm of his style. Hence the fifth decade does not produce the same impression as the preceding parts. We may also suppose that the lost books, independently of some great brilliant portions, such as characteristics and speeches, may in their diction scarcely have equalled the extant books.

12. A means of pourtraying characters frequently and successfully employed by Livy is the speeches he interposes in order to give a portrait of a certain person (XLV 25, 3) or to indicate the motives of one of his characters (e. g. VIII 7, cf. III 47, 5), and which for this reason have so little pretension to historical truth (cf. in hanc sententiam locutum accipio III 67, 1) as not even to shun anachronisms (e. g. V 4, 12) or to attempt to imitate the style of the time. But they are generally a very faithful reflection of the character or condition of the speaker; cf. e. g. VII 34. In some instances we are still able to trace in what manner Livy rhetorically enlarges upon the brief hints of a predecessor, comp. Polyb. III 64 with Liv. XXI 40 sq. On

the rhetorical character of the history of Livy see H. Taine, essai sur Tite-Live, Paris 1856. 348 pp.

13. Livy's relation is characterized by a certain rotundity and easy fulness, like that of Herodotus (comp. Quintilian above n. 2), so as to become really garrulous in some parts. Quintil. VIII 3, 53: vitanda *μακρολογία*, i. e. longior quam oportet sermo, ut apud T. Livium. Cf. Charis. p. 242 P. = 271 K. with the parallel passages indicated in Keil's note, and M. Hertz, prolusio not. 77. This quality also reminds us of the manner of Cicero whom Livy imitated (see above 251, 4) and approached more closely than any other Roman prose-writer. Though his rhetorical art is conspicuous throughout his work, it never becomes artifice or want of naturalness. Livy's great facility of feeling the motives of a certain situation lends also his descriptions the colouring suitable to the situation.

14. Livy's diction is intentionally (see 251, 4) classical, and it certainly approaches the standard of classicality far more closely than Quintilian or Tacitus in the dialogus. But even in Livy numerous poetical phrases betray the approach of the silver age (haec ubi dicta dedit; ubi Mars est atrocissimus; ad arma consternatum esse; cogitationibus animum volutare; adversa montium; stupens animi; laeta pascua etc.), as does also a certain fondness of strong expressions (e. g. attonitus, ingens; see above 224, 7). It may have been his employment of words which sometimes appeared strange to those who were accustomed to the sermo urbanus. Quintil. I 5, 55 sq.: peregrina (verba) ex omnibus, prope dixerim, gentibus . . venerunt; . . quemadmodum Pollio (see above 218, 6) deprehendit in Livio patavinitatem. Cf. ib. VIII 1, 2: ut sint (verba) quam minime peregrina et externa. (3.) et in T. Livio, mirae facundiae viro, putat inesse Pollio Asinius quandam patavinitatem. D. G. Morhof, de patavinitate Liviana, Kil. 1685 (also in Drakenborch's Livy XV 1. p. 50 sqq.). C. G. Wiedemann, quaestio de patavinitate Livii, I—III. Görlitz 1848. 1854. 1855. 4.

15. "In point of diction especially the first decade which Livy seems to have published separately is remarkable for many peculiarities: the style is still fluctuating, but becomes more settled in the later books; Livy himself may be said to have created and formed his historical style in the first three books. This difference appears not only in the meaning and construction of single words, but also in his command of words. To quote an instance, in his first decade Livy has indulged in undue freedom with certain frequentatives." E. Wölfflin, on the criticism and diction of Livy (Berlin 1864. 4.) p. 29. Other literature on the diction of Livy. F. Hand, Manual of Latin Style p. 64—66. C. J. Grysar, Theory of Latin Style, sec. ed. p. 7 sqq. and in the preface to his part. sel. Liv. p. XXXVII sqq. Weissenborn's introd. p. 37 sqq. Queck, Contributions to a characteristic of Livy II: on Livy's diction, Sondershausen 1853. 4.

16. E. F. Poppo, de latinitate falso aut merito suspecta, Frankf. a/O. 1841. 4. Stange, de discrepantia quadam inter sermonem Cic. et Liv., ibd. 1843. 4. Kreizner, de propria orationis Livianae indole, Hadamar 1844. 4. E. Wesener, de quibusdam Liv. orationis proprietatibus, Coblenz 1854. 4. and De periodorum Liv. proprietatibus, Fulda 1860. 4. G. Hildebrand, on some discrepancies of diction between Cicero, Caesar, Livy, and others. Trem. 1854. 4., and Contributions concerning Livy's diction, Dortmund 1865. 4. E. Krah, spec. grammaticae Liv., Insterburg 1859. 4. Baur, de aliquot translationum Liv. generibus, Augsburg 1864. 4. C. E. Güthling, de T. Livii oratione. c. I: de usu verborum simplicium, Lauban 1867. 4. L. Kühnast, the chief points of Livy's syntax, second edition, Berlin 1872. 403 pp.

J. E. Ellendt, de praepos. *a* cum nominibus urbium iunctae apud Liv. maxime usu, Königsberg 1843. 4. H. Löwe, de praepos. *de* usu apud Livium, Grimma 1847. 4. Kleine, de genetivi usu Liviano, Part. I. Cleve 1865. 4.

Ernesti, Glossarium Livianum, ed. G. H. Schaefer, Lips. 1804.

253. About the same time as Livy and as it were to supplement his history, Pompeius Trogus wrote his Universal History, Historiae Philippicae, in 44 books, beginning with Ninus and extending to the writer's own time, from Greek sources, in a lively style and classical diction, also more rich in material and less rhetorical, hence also more trustworthy, than Livy. We know the work chiefly through the abridgment of Justinus. Besides his historical work, Trogus wrote also on zoology and botany, after the best authorities, Aristotle and Theophrastus.

1. Justin. XLIII 5, 11 sq.: in postremo libro Trogus maiores suos a Vocontiis originem ducere, avum suum Trogum Pompeium Sertoriano bello civitatem a Cn. Pompeio percepisse dicit, patruum Mithridatico bello turmas sub eodem Pompeio duxisse, patrem quoque sub G. Caesare militasse epistularumque et legationum, simul et anuli curam habuisse. His grandfather's name may, therefore, have been Cn. Pomp. Tr.; according to an inscription from Vaison (J. Becker, Jahrb. der rheinl. Alt. Fr. XVIII p. 127—130) his patruus was probably called Q.; his father was probably Cn. Pompeius whom Caesar b. g. V 36 mentions as an interpreter used by himself, whence it becomes probable that the historian had also the praenomen of Cn. J. Becker, Philol. VII p. 389—391. See ibid. II p. 305.

2. Charis. I p. 102, 10 sq. K.: Valgius et Verrius et Trogus de animalibus. ib. p. 137, 9 sq.: Trogum de animalibus libro X. A longer quotation from this (Trogus, et ipse auctor e severissimis) ap. Plin. N. H. XI 52, 275 sq., in a passage which is a careless translation from

Aristotle's H. A. Pliny quotes Trogus b. 7, 10, 11, 17, 31, and mentions him in his list of sources in b. 8, 9, 12, 13—16, 18. As b. 12—18 treat of trees and agriculture, Trogus would appear to have written a work de plantis, which he may have taken from Theophrastus just as he took his work on zoology from Aristotle. A. v. Gutschmid (see n. 4) p. 180—186.

3. His principal work is the 44 books historiarum philippicarum, arranged according to ethnographic views, with special reference to the history of Macedonia and the time of the successors of Alexander the Great, and proportionate neglect of Roman history (the regal period is brought in as late as b. 43), perhaps because this had already been treated by Livy. B. 1—6 give as an introduction the history of Asia and Greece. The latest fact mentioned in the work is the recovery of the standards taken by the Parthians a. 734 (XLII 5, 11). It is conjectured that XLII 4, 16 (Parthia, in qua iam quasi sollemne est reges parricidas haberi) was meant in reference to the murder of Phraates IV by his son Phraataces, c. 9 A. D. The fatalism inherent to ancient historiography appeared also in Tr. (XLII 4, 16: fatum Parthiae fecit ut etc.). The lively style of the work is frequently conspicuous even in Justinus' abridgement. Justin. praef. 1 calls him vir priscae eloquentiae, cf. Vopisc. Prob. 2, 7: ut non Sallustios, Livios, Tacitos, Trogos atque omnes disertissimos imitarer viros. Respectable historical principles seem to be indicated in XXXVIII 3, 11: quam (orationem) obliquam Pompeius Trogus exposuit, quoniam in Livio et in Sallustio reprehendit quod contiones directas pro sua oratione operi suo inserendo historiae modum excesserint. He referred to his contemporary Virgil; see Serv. ad Aen. VI 783: de hoc loco et Trogus et Probus quaerunt. Hugo de Fleury (Ecclesiastical History; abbot of Canterbury after 1091?) and from him the chronicler Roger Wendover and from him again Matthew of Westminster, Flores histor. (ed. 1570) I p. 81 (see A. v. Gutschmid p. 260 sq., Reifferscheid's Suetonius p. 382 sq., and especially F. Rühl, on Justinus p. 25—41): anno divinae incarnationis nono, Caesare Augusto imperii sui LIum agente annum (a. 862), Trogus Pompeius chronica sua terminavit . . . Romanorum remp. . . ab initio usque ad praesens tempus prosequitur. Radulfus de Diceto, de viris illustr. (of a. 1210, from unknown good sources): Trogus Pompeius a tempore Nini regis Assyriorum usque ad annum XXIXum Hyrcani principis Iudaeorum Chronica sua digessit (Rühl, l. l. p. 32).

4. Our knowledge of Trogus' Universal History is derived partly from the 'prologi' (tables of contents) of all the books, partly from the abridgment of Justinus who says in his preface: Trogus Pompeius graecas et totius historias orbis latino sermone conposuit. . . cuius libris omnium saeculorum, regum, nationum populorumque res gestae continentur. . . ea omnia Pompeius divisa temporibus et serie rerum digesta conposuit. horum igitur XLIV voluminum (nam totidem edidit) per otium quo in urbe versabamur cognitione quaeque dignissima ex-

cerpsi. Some passages are also quoted by Priscian, Cassiodorus (Jordanis), Servius and Junilius Flagrius; see A. v. Gutschmid p. 186—202. All other writers know only Justinus, though they may mention Trogus. The fragments which Bielowski (n. 5) pretended to have taken from Polish chronicles have been shown to be fictions by A. v. Gutschmid, on the fragments of P. Tr. and the credibility of their authorities, in Fleckeisen's Jahrb., Suppl. II (1856 sq.) p. 202—282. Comp. du Rieu in the Mnemosyne III (1854) p. 177—183. J. Bernays, Rh. Mus. X p. 293—298.

5. Pompei Trogi fragmenta . . una cum prologis historiarum Philipp. et criticis annotationibus edidit Aug. Bielowski, Lemberg 1853. XXVI and 91 pp. The fragments of the Hist. are also collected in the editions of Justinus by Frotscher I p. XCVIII—CIV, and by Johanneau and Dübner (Paris 1833) II p. 221—225. A. H. L. Heeren, de Trogi fontibus, in the comment soc. Gotting. XV. a. 1804 (reprinted in Frotscher's edition), where, besides Theopompus and Timaeus, also Clitarchus (C. Raun, de Clitarcho Diodori, Curtii, Justini auctore, Bonn 1868), Polybius (see H. Nissen, Critical Investigations p. 305—307), and Posidonius are proved to have been used by Trogus. H. Wolffgarten, de Ephori et Dinonis historiis a Trogo Pompeio expressis, Bonn 1868. 86 pp. W. Fricke, on Plutarch's sources in his Alcibiades (Leipzig 1869) p. 71 sqq. L. E. Hallberg, de Tr. Pomp., Paris 1869. — Trogi prologi, ed. G. H. Grauert, Münster 1827.

6. The time of Justinus is not positively known, though probably he lived in the age of the Antonines (F. Rühl, p. 36). Considering his correct mode of thinking and the style of his preface as well as his reference to Cato the Elder, we should not like to put him much later than Florus who epitomized Livy. Comp. C. Lachmann, Rh. Mus. III p. 614. Radulfus de Diceto (see n. 3) says indeed (Rühl p. 32): Iustinus philosophus Trogi Pompei abbreviator, scripsit eodem anno (in which Josephus finished his Antiquities), but confounds him with Justus of Tiberias, just as in the Middle Ages he was confounded with Justinus Martyr (Rühl p. 36 sq. cf. p. 46 sq.). The first writer who mentions Justinus is Jerome (Opp. ed. Vallars. V p. 621: praecipue nostri Livii et Pompei Trogi atque Justini, qui omnem extremae visionis narrant historiam).

7. On Justinus' treatment see praef. 4: omissis his quae nec cognoscendi voluptate iucunda nec exemplo erant necessaria breve veluti florum corpusculum ('an anthology') feci. Cf. n. 4. August. de civ. dei IV 6 in.: Iustinus qui graecam vel potius peregrinam, Trogum Pompeium secutus, non latine tantum . . verum etiam breviter scripsit historiam. Oros. I 8: Pompeius historicus eiusque breviator Justinus; ib. 10: Pompeius sive Justinus. Justinus seems to have made but few changes in the diction of Trogus and to have only alloyed it with several new additions. Justinus' individual talents were but very small.

Aethicus Ister employed probably a different abridgment of Pomp. Tr. (perhaps in Cassiodorus' Gothic history); see Rühl p. 6—10.

8. In the Middle Ages the abridgment of Justinus was much read and copied, without however belonging to school-reading. See F. Rühl, on the acquaintance of the Middle Ages with Justinus, a literary and historical Investigation, Leipzig (Teubner) 1871. 52 pp. The extant mss. of Justinus are descended from three different archetypes which seem to have existed as early as saec. IV. A separate class is represented by the Cod. Casinas (C) saec. XI, now Laurent. plut. 66, 21. The other two classes, the Italian and Transalpine (T) are indeed derived from a common original, but differ greatly in their text, and had in their immediate archetypes different gaps, some of which were very extensive. The earliest representatives of I are Eusebianus saec. X (E), and in saec. XI Laurent. 66, 20 (F), Sessorianus (S), Vossianus Q. 101 (L); the genuine tradition of class T is contained saec. IX in Puteaneus (A), Sangallensis (H), Floriacensis = Voss. Q. 32 (V), saec. X Monacensis (M), Franequeranus 24 saec. XI (R), and saec. XII Weingartensis = Gissensis (G), Bern 160 and 538 (B and D) and others. Rühl p. 3 sq. cf. p. 11 sq. 18 sq. 23 sq. 48—50, and his work on the sources of the text of Justinus. On the Gissensis see F. W. Otto, commentar. crit. de codd. bibl. Giss. 1843, p. 201—250. (See also J. Jeep in his Praefatio and in the Wolfenbüttel program 1855. 30 pp. 4.). A. Rozsek, on five mss. of Justinus, Graz 1871. 20 pp. (Progr.)

9. Editions of Justinus. Ed. princ. Venet. 1470 and Rom. 1470. 4. Ald. 1522. From good mss. J. Bongarsius (cum notis), Paris. 1581; augmented by Fr. Modius (Francof. 1587). Cum notis Is. Vossii, Lugd. B. 1640. Cum notis variorum ed. I. G. Graevius, Utrecht 1668. Lugd. B. 1683. 1701. Variorum edition by Abr. Gronovius, Lugd. B. 1719. 1760; augmented by C. H. Frotscher, Lips. 1827—1830. 3 vols. Ed. J. F. Fischer (Lips. 1757), J. C. F. Wetzel (Lignit. 1806), Benecke (with notes, Leipzig 1830), Fr. Dübner (adnot. crit. instr., Lips. Teubner 1831), W. Fittbogen (with notes, Halle 1835), Johanneau et Dübner (Paris 1838. 2 vols.), and especially rec. Just. Jeep (Lips. 1859, Bibl. Teubner; with comm. criticus p. 1—188; ed. minor 1862). Also ed. Fr. Arnulf (varias lectt. ex II codd. Taurinens. adiecit, Turin 1848. (508 pp.), G. H. Th. Hartwig (school-edition, Brunswick 1852), H. Domke et G. Eitner (in us. schol., Breslau 1865).

10. J. F. Recke, on the peculiarities of Justinus' diction, Mühlhausen 1855. 25 pp. 4. J. F. Müller, de usuum ap. Iust. usu, Budissin 1859. 20 pp. 4. Bozek, de natura latinitatis Iustinianae, Hermanstadt 1865. 4. Fr. Fischer, de elocutione Iustini, Halle 1868. 66 pp.

Rzesinski, de Iustino Trogi epitomatore. Krakau 1826. U. Köhler, Critical observations on Justinus, in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 91, p. 427—430. F. Rühl, ibid. 101, p. 21—24.

254. At the close of the Augustan period and perhaps under Tiberius wrote the exact scholar Fenestella, whose pattern was Varro. Like Varro, he himself edited an abridgment of his Annals, and both in these and in a separate work, devoted much attention to the history of Roman manners and to the political condition of Rome. L. Arruntius imitated and rather exaggerated Sallust's manner in his History of the Punic wars. The early history of Rome was, perhaps in this period, related by Annius Fetialis, and A. Cremutius Cordus composed an account of the events of recent history.

1. Hieronym. on Eus. Chron. ad a. Abr. 2035 = 6 Tiberii = 772 v. c.: Fenestella historiarum scriptor et carminum septuagenarius moritur sepeliturque Cumis. He would, therefore, seem to have been born 702, which agrees with Plut. Crass. 5 extr.: *τούτων φησὶ τὴν ἑτέραν* (who was about 18 years old a. 668, and therefore born c. 650) *ἤδη πρεσβῦτιν οὖσαν ὁ Φαινεστέλλας ἰδεῖν αὐτὸς καὶ πολλάκις ἀκοῦσαι* (perhaps in Spain). Not much probability attaches, therefore, to the statement of Pliny N. H. XXXIII 52: sua memoria coeptum Fenestella tradit, qui obiit novissimo Tiberii Caesaris principatu. As Tiberius died 790 = 37, this statement would oblige us to place Fenestella's life c. 719—789 (Mercklin p. 3). That he wrote the work in question in the reign of Tiberius, does not appear from Pliny N. H. VIII, 74: togas rasas . . divi Augusti (words of Pliny?) novissimis temporibus coepisse scribit Fenestella. It is certain that he wrote before Asconius who frequently impugns him. The statement of Lydus is certainly wrong de mag. III 75: *ὡς Φενεστέλλας καὶ Σισέννας οἱ Ῥωμαῖοί φασιν, ὧν τὰς χρήσεις ὁ Βάρρων ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων ἀνήγαγεν. ἐγὼ δὲ τὰς βίβλους οὔπω τεθέαμαι.* Probably Fenestella quoted Sisenna and Varro, and Lydus' source seems to have mixed up the three names. Praenomen and nomen of Fenestella are unknown; the same applies to his carmina.

2. Fenestella is quoted as an authority on numerous statements concerning political and ritual conditions, e. g. on provocatio, the Quaestors, the XVviri, the leges Aureliae, dies festi and profesti, the Roman year, the ludi circenses, libri sibyllini, also on the expense of the aqua Marcia; concerning costumes (togae rasae, uniones, anuli aurei, calcei, silver vessels), living (fish, introduction of olea, rise of luxury) and literary history (on Terence and Cicero). But we never find his Annals quoted as the source of any of these statements, except in the very uncertain passage in Nonius v. praesente. The definite quotations from the Annals actually bear the stamp of a relation of events, but those other statements are remarkable for something reflective, though connected with numerical dates (Mercklin p. 10). See

also Sen. Epist. 108, 31: aeque notat (Cicero in Rep.) . . provocationem ad populum etiam a regibus fuisse: id ita in pontificalibus libris, et alii putant et Fenestella. The manner in which Fenestella is here associated with the pontificales libri, agrees with the joint mention made of him together with Gracchanus (above 133, 2) and Trebatius (who wrote de religionibus, above 189, 3) by Ulpian, Dig. I 13, 1, 1: et Junius et Trebatius et Fenestella scribunt. We may, perhaps, connect with this the mention made of him as annalium commentator (or = scriptor?) in Tertull. adv. Valent. 34, p. 303. Pliny mentions and uses him as a source in b. VIII (de elephantis etc.), IV (de aquatilium natura), XV (frugiferae arbores), XXXIII (metals), XXXV (painting).

3. Accurate quotations of the Annals of F. occur only in Nonius, p. 221 sq. v. reticulum (perhaps from a description of habits): Fen. annalium (III), p. 154, 20 (v. praesente): Fenestella annal. l. II (of unknown time), and p. 385, 9 (v. rumor): F. annali l. XXII (of a. 698 v. v.). There is no doubt that Plutarch Sull. 28 and Crass. 4 sq. derives his information from Fenestella's Annals. Even if the historical statements were taken from the Annals, they do not prove that they were carried to the regal period, as they may have occurred in excursuses (Mercklin, Pliny N. H. XV 1). The errors traced in Fenestella by Asconius and Gellius are partly of no consequence (Mercklin p. 9 sq.), partly are they based upon divergence of opinion, and do not, therefore, upset the judgment of Lactantius (inst. div. I 6, 14): Fenestella diligentissimus scriptor, which is rather borne out by such passages as Sueton. vit. Terent. 1 and Macrob. I 10, 5 sq. See also Lactant. de ira dei 22, 5: plurimi et maximi auctores tradiderunt, . . nostrorum Varro et Fenestella. The few connected passages, which we know (especially ap. Non. v. rumor, also Prisc. VIII 20 p. 386, 13 sq. Htz) prove his style to have been discursive and circumstantial. Hence an abridgment mentioned by Diomed. I p. 365, 7 sq.: apud Fenestellam in libro epitomarum secundo: quemadmodum Caesar a piratis captus sit etc. This appears to have been a kind of table of contents, like the prologues of Trogus, though much more extensive than these. On the sole authority of Fulgentius (myth. III 2) rests and is, therefore, almost devoid of authority the citation: ut Fenestella in Achaicis (or Arch.) scribit.

4. The fragments of Fenestella were for the last time collected in Frotscher's edition of Corte's Sallust (Lips. 1825) I p. 489—494. See also the additions by L. Mercklin, de Fen. p. 12, and by J. Poeth, de Fen. p. 21—56. L. Mercklin, de Fenestella historico et poeta, Dorpat 1844. 12 pp. 4. A tedious account by J. Poeth, de Fen. historiarum scriptore et carminum, Bonn 1849.

5. The two books de magistratibus et sacerdotiis Romanorum published under the name of L. Fenestella (e. g. Vindob. 1510. 4. Paris 1530. 1535) are the composition of the Canon Andr. Dom. Fiochi (+ 1452) and were also edited under his name (Floccus) by Aegid.

Witsius 1561. This forgery was so very naïve as to mention 'episcopi' and 'archiepiscopi' among the sacerdotia.

6. Suet. gramm. 20: fuit (Hyginus) familiarissimus Ovidio poetae et Clodio Licino consulari historico, qui eum . . tradit liberalitate sua quoad vixerit sustentatum. He is no doubt the cons. suff. of a. 757 (ex Kal. Iul.) Caius Clodius Licinus (Orelli 644. 3260; C. I. lat. I p. 473 sq. 180), and perhaps also identical with Clodius Licinus quoted by Livy in libro IV rerum romanarum (a. 560) with rather astonishing accuracy. Of the same we should probably understand Nonius v. pristis (Claudius rerum romanarum libro XII) and v. patibulum (Licinius rerum rom. libro XXI). It would, therefore, seem that he began his history with the Punic wars and carried it down to the time of Augustus. M. Hertz, de historic. 1871. p. 4—9.

7. Sen. Epist. 114, 17: L. Arruntius, vir rarae frugalitatis (Vellei. II 86, 2 of a. 723: L. Arruntii, prisca gravitate celeberrimi, fides), qui historias belli punici scripsit, fuit Sallustianus et in illud genus nitens. 18: quae apud Sallustium rara fuerunt apud hunc crebra sunt et paene continua. ib. 19: Arruntius in primo libro belli punici. Tac. A. XI 6: meminissent . . recentiorum Arruntii et Aesernini; ad summa provectos incorrupta vita et facundia. Sen. controv. VII praef. 7 (p. 182, 2 sqq. Bu.) mentions him as an adversary of new-fashioned eloquence. He is probably L. Arruntius L. f. who was consul a. 732 together with Acerninus, and was the father of the consul a. 759 who bears the same name and died a. 790. The historian is no doubt the same Arruntius as is mentioned by Pliny in his list of sources in b. III, V and VI (the description of Spain, Africa and Asia).

8. Annius Fatialis, mentioned by Pliny among his sources in b. 16, 33 and 36, and quoted XXXIV 13, 29 as an authority for the statement that the statue of Cloelia rather represented a Valeria; a statement probably originally due to Valerius Antias (Schwegler, Hist. of Rome II p. 8) and which should perhaps even attributed to him in Pliny (by changing Annius into Antias). H. Peter, hist. I p. CCCXVIII. CCCXXI.

9. Iulius Marathus, libertus et a memoria eius (Augustus), . . tradit, Suet. Aug. 79, cf. 94: auctor est I. M. (of a legend in praise of Augustus).

10. On Cremutius Cordus see below 292, 1.

11. On T. Labienus see below 262, 8. On the historical works of Hyginus and Verrius Flaccus see below 256, 1 sq. 257, 2.

255. As concerns the grammarians, Sinnius Capito followed the example of earlier writers in composing both grammatical works and such as treated of the history of literature. Varro's influence on Sinnius appears in the national

tendency of his investigations and in the epistolary form adopted by him.

1. M. Hertz, on Sinnius Capito, an Essay on the history of Roman Grammar, Berlin 1845. A collection of his fragments ibid. p. 27—37. Cf. Egger, vet. serm. lat. reliqq. p. 63—68.

2. Gell. V 20, 1: soloecismus, . . a Sinnio Capitone eiusdemque aetatis aliis imparilitas appellatus, vetustioribus Latinis stribiligo dicebatur. 21, 9—11: Sinni Capitonis, doctissimi viri (cf. Hieron. in n. 3), epistulae sunt uno in libro multae positae . . in templo Pacis. prima epistula scripta est ad Pacuvium Labeonem. . . in ea rationes grammaticas posuit per quas docet "pluria" latinum esse, "plura" barbarum. 28, 2: Sinnius Capito in literis quas ad Clodium Tuscum dedit. Cf. Festus p. 162 (si diligentius inspiciatur, ut fecit Sinnius Capito). 170 M. To the same class we should probably add the liber de syllabis . . Sinni Capitonis mentioned by Pomp. p. 110, 2 Keil (Gramm. lat. V). Cf. J. Becker, Ztsch. f. AW. 1847, nr. 133. In his etymologies (Fest. p. 138. 230. 340) Capito, like Nigidius (186, 4) appears as a purist.

3. Lactant. Inst. div. VI 20, 35: Sinnius Capito in libris spectaculorum docet. Cf. Festus p. 326 and 364. M. Hertz p. 20 sq. His explanations of proverbial phrases (Fest. p. 145. 261. 282. 322. 325. 334) were probably contained in a work specially devoted to this subject. Hertz p. 22. 32 sqq. Philologus I p. 610 sqq. Geographical and ethnographical investigations? Hieronym. in Gen. III p. 319 Vall.: legamus Varronis de antiquitatibus libros et Sinnii Capitonis et Graecum Phlegonta ceterosque eruditissimos viros, et videbimus omnes paene insulas etc. Hertz p. 23. 30 sq., who uses this passage in support of his assumption (p. 25) that Sinnius Capito, like Varro, wrote a comprehensive work, Antiquitates or De antiquitatibus, in which he stored up his investigations on subjects of Roman religion, polity, and law. C. Wachsmuth in his edition of Lyd. de ostent. p. XX, understands of this also Lyd. ost. 3 (p. 6, 16) and de magistr. prooem. (ὅ τε *Καπίτων καὶ Φονιήιος*).

256. Fenestella's and Sinnius Capito's tendency in the investigation of antiquarian lore and their Varronian direction were shared by the learned freedman M. Verrius Flaccus, chiefly known by his Fasti and his comprehensive lexicon entitled de verborum significatu, a rich store-house of the most important information concerning Roman antiquities. We possess a great part of the abridgment made of this work by Pompeius Festus, and also the abridgment made again of Festus by the deacon Paulus, both of whom adopted the method of omitting antiquated and obsolete statements.

1. Suet. gramm. 17: M. Verrius Flaccus libertinus docendi genere maxime inclaruit. . . quare, ab Augusto quoque nepotibus eius (born 734 and 737) praeceptor electus transiit in Palatium cum tota schola. . . decessit aetatis exactae sub Tiberio. statuam habet Praeneste in inferiore fori parte, circa hemicyclium in quo fastos a se ordinatos et marmoreo parieti incisos publicarat. On this see above 64, 3 and 64, 8, 9. Verrius Flaccus, iuris pontificii peritissimus, one of whose sayings is quoted from Varro by Macrob. I 15, 21, might perhaps be his freedman.

2. The fragments of Verrius are collected in the editions of Festus by Dacier, Lindemann and O. Müller (Praef. p. XIII—XVI). Gellius IV, 5, 6: in Verri Flacci libro primo rerum memoria dignarum. From the same source may be derived the statements of Pliny N. H. III, VII, VIII, IX, XIV, XV, XVIII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXIII—XXXV Gell. XVII 6, 2: libri . . . Verrii Flacci de obscuris Catonis (above 108, 4) in libro secundo scriptum est etc. V 17, 1 (and 18, 2): Verrius Flaccus in quarto de verborum significatu. Schol. Veron. ad Aen. X 183 and 200 (p. 103 K.): Flaccus primo Etruscarum. Macrob. I 4, 7 (cf. ib. 8, 5): Verrius Flaccus in eo libello qui Saturnus inscribitur. Vague quotations concerning Roman ritual ib. 6, 15. 10, 7. 12, 15. Lactant. Inst. I 20. Serv. Aen. VIII 203. XI 143 (alii, sicut Varro et Verrius Flaccus, dicunt). Concerning his (questionable) studies on Virgil see Ribbeck, prolegg. Verg. p. 175—177. Suet. gramm. 19: Scribonius Aphrodisius . . docuit quo Verrius tempore, cuius etiam libris de orthographia rescripsit non sine insectatione studiorum morumque eius. From this work are probably derived the statements on the orthographical views of Verrius Flaccus in Charisius, Diomede, and Velius Longus. If the disquisitions given there with regard to gender, accidence, and etymology be derived from the same work, it would appear that Verrius took orthography in the sense of spelling in conformity with linguistic rules. Like Varro, he also used epistolary form in his grammatical disquisitions; cf. Serv. Aen. VIII 423: antea hoc adverbium loci fuit; . . nam crebro in antiquis lectionibus invenitur, sicut in epistolis probat Verrius Flaccus exemplis, auctoritate, ratione.

3. The work de verborum significatu was alphabetically arranged by Verrius, so that each letter extended over a number of books, e. g. P over at least five (Festus p. 326 b, 2 sq. M.: causam Verrius in libro V quorum prima est P litera reddidit), A over at least four (see Gellius in n. 2), and S over several books in the same way (Fest. p. 309 a, 5 sq.: Suburam Verrius alio libro — in Festus p. 302 a, 15 sqq. — a pago Succusano dictam ait, hoc vero maxime probat eorum auctoritatem qui etc.). Within each separate letter the alphabetical arrangement seems again to have been observed, but without consistency and frequently interfered with by other, especially antiquarian, interests. O. Müller p. XVI—XXIX with the following result: Verrium apparet libros de verb. sign. omnes secundum literas disposuisse, neque in ea re primas tantum sed etiam secundas tertiasque literas respexisse,

sed ita ut saepe literas inter se affines, velut E et I, O et V, uno capite comprehenderet et consonantibus maius pondus tribueret quam vocalibus, denique ut singulorum capitum . . ordinem ad arbitrium magis quam ex alphabeti lege constitueret. idcirco putaverim Verrium quae ex variis scriptoribus . . excerpsisset vel ipse excogitasset in singulas chartas coniecisse easque deinde non certo ordine digestas librariis tradidisse describendas. All the works of Virgil are quoted in this work, Horace never. Of Varro various works are quoted, his work de lingua latina never, perhaps because Verrius considered it a failure (see above 155, 2) and yet did not like to impugn its statements. The works of Antistius Labeo, Veranius, and Ateius Capito are quoted only in the second part of the work. The date of the composition of the work may be inferred from p. 154 b, 7 sq.: cum mansisset ab urbe condita ad principatum Augusti Caesaris inviolatum, and (v. senacula) p. 347, 25: ubi nunc est aedis Concordiae inter Capitolium et forum, this temple having been consecrated a. 763. Hence the work would appear to be one of the latest of Verrius. See Merkel on Ovid's Fasti p. XCIV sqq.

4. Festus himself states his treatment of Verrius' work in the following manner, v. porriciam p. 218 b.: cuius (i. e. Verrius) opinionem neque in hoc neque in aliis compluribus refutare minime necesse est, cum propositum habeam ex tanto librorum eius numero intermortua iam et sepulta verba atque ipso saepe confitente nullius usus aut auctoritatis praeterire, et reliqua quam brevissime redigere in libros admodum paucos. (Fortunately he is not consistent in the execution of this plan.) ea autem de quibus dissentio et aperte et breviter, ut sciero, scripta in his libris meis invenientur (qui) inscribuntur "priscorum verborum cum exemplis". The latter work of Festus has disappeared without the slightest trace. His abridgment of Verrius is made in rather a mechanical manner, sometimes with additions from other works of Verrius, rarely adding original matter, which is, however, always stated in as many words as possible (v. monstrum, p. 138 b.: inde dici apparet id quartum quod mihi visum est adiciendum, praesertim cum ex eadem significatione pendeat et in promptu sit omnibus). He mentions only incidentally that he owes all his learning to Verrius, generally only if he thinks himself competent to correct him. E. g. v. pictor p. 209 a, 12 sq.: cur hoc loco relatum sit a Verrio, cum de significatu verborum scribere propositum habuerit, equidem non video; so also v. Tatium (p. 360—362 M.): quod ad significationem verborum non magis pertinet quam plurima alia et praeterita iam et deinceps quae referentur. Cf. v. porriciam, p. 218 M.

5. The age in which Sex. Pompeius Festus lived is not known, but p. 369 he quotes Martial, and p. 277a Granius (?) and is himself quoted by Charisius (i. e. Iulius Romanus) p. 220, 28 sq. K. (Porphyrio ex Verrio et Festo), also by Macrobius (Sat. III 3, 10 and 5, 7 Pompeius Festus; III 8, 9 Iulius Festus de verborum significatiooibus libro XIII). He belongs, perhaps, to the second century of the Christian era. He

divided his abridgment into 20 books of nearly equal size, without minding that each book should begin a new letter (O. Müller p. XXXI sq.). We possess the work in only one ms. (see Rh. Mus. XVII p. 310), cod. Farnesianus saec., XI (now at Naples), which was no doubt complete in that century. The Illyrian scholar Manilius Rhallus brought the last nine quaternios (out of the 16 which the ms. originally contained), beginning with the second half of the letter M, to Rome (to Pomponius Laetus) and even these badly injured by fire in the left column. Three (quat. VIII, X, XVI) of these nine have since then been lost again and are known to us only in the copies made of them in the 15th century (since the time of Ursinus wrongly called schedae Pomponii Laeti). The XVIth quaternio especially was known to several scholars (e. g. Politian and the copyist of Vat. 2731) who lacked more or less of the rest (e. g. Politianus the quaternios VIII, IX and X). Cf. O. Müller's edition p. II—VII, and Th. Mommsen in the Trans. of the Academy at Berlin 1864, p. 57—66.

6. Just as Festus' abridgment may originally have caused the loss of the original work, Festus himself was in his turn superseded by his epitomator, the priest Paulus (commonly called Diaconus without much foundation, see Bethmann in Pertz's Archiv X p. 320 sqq.) under Charlemagne. In the epistle to the latter which serves as preface, we read: Sextus Pompeius . . opus suum ad XX usque prolixa volumina extendit. ex qua ego prolixitate superflua quaeque et minus necessaria praetergrediens et quaedam abstrusa penitus stilo proprio enucleans, nonnulla ita ut erant posita relinquens, haec vestrae celsitudini legendum compendium obtuli. Paulus endeavoured to adapt the abridgment of Festus to the very moderate wants of his own period, but in so doing shows just as much tact and knowledge as might be expected from the age in which he lived. But the original work was so rich and extensive that even this repeated abridging and diluting could not efface all its original wealth. Paulus deserves praise for his almost general abstinence from additions of his own, and even in details he generally maintained the arrangement of Festus. As he copies even the orthographical mistakes of the cod. Farnes. of Festus or avoids them by omitting the words in question, it seems that he used the same ms. of Festus as the copyist of the Farnesianus. See O. Müller's Preface p. XXXII sq. VIII sq. The abridgment of Paulus exists in a great many mss., which may be divided into two classes. The one renders Paulus' words with the greatest fidelity, e. g. the Munich ms. saec. XI and the Wolfenbüttel ms. saec. X. The other class contains the imperfect attempts of such as thought themselves qualified to correct the text; of this class we mention especially a Lipsiensis and Berolinensis; see O. Müller p. IX—XII. At Troyes also a cod. saec. IX is said to exist; see Catalogue général des mss. (Paris 1856). II. nr. 2291.

7. Besides this we possess some detached notices preserved by writers who used Verrius before Festus, or Festus before Paulus.

The first is the case in the excerpt from Suetonius' Prata, libr. IX ap. Isidor. de nat. rer. 44, in Reifferscheid's Suetonius p. 242—244; the latter in the glossaries of Placidus and the Greek-Latin glossaries, especially in the first letters; see O. Müller's Festus p. XXXIII sq. and p. 380 sq.

8. Editions of Festus and Paulus (cf. Müller's preface p. XXXV—XLII). Ed. princ. of the latter Mediol. 1471 and many times subsequently. Festus and Paulus (together with Nonius and Varro) were mixed up, from the papers of I. B. Pius, by Conagus, Mediol. 1510 and subsequently. Ald. Venet. 1513. Festus and Paulus were separated and a critical treatment inaugurated by Ant. Augustinus, Venet. 1559 and elsewhere. Excellent contributions to the criticism of the whole are found in Jos. Scaliger's edition, 1565. With supplements by Fulvius Ursinus, Rome 1581 sq. Notis et emend. illustr. A. Dacier, Paris 1681 and Amsterd. 1700. In Lindemann's Corp. gramm. lat. II, and separately Lips. 1832. 4. Edidit A. E. Egger, Paris 1838. Principal edition: emendata et annotata a C. O. Müller, Lips. 1839. 4.

9. Contributions to the criticism of the text by L. Mercklin (Observationes ad etc. Dorpat 1860. 14 pp. 4.), W. Corssen (Philologus XX p. 730—737), Th. Mommsen (Festi codicis quaternionem XVIum denuo edidit, Trans. of the Academy of Berlin 1864, p. 66—86) and others.

10. A. Baumstark in Pauly's Encycl. III p. 463—466. H. E. Dirksen, the sources used by Verrius Flaccus and Festus in their statements on Roman law, Trans. of the Academy at Berlin 1852, p. 133—184 = Posthumous writings I p. 64—108.

257. Augustus' freedman and librarian C. Iulius Hyginus (c. 690—770?) combined the studies of Varro with those of Nigidius Figulus. He imitated Varro in the variety of his literary activity and in the national character of it. He wrote de situ urbium italicarum and on celebrated men of Roman history; but he also wrote commentaries on one of Cinna's poems and on Virgil's works and composed original works on agriculture and the treatment of bees. In imitation of Nigidius, Hyginus composed works on theology and astrology, which seem, however, to have been more sober than those of Nigidius. We possess under the name of Hyginus two school-treatises on mythology; the first containing 277 Fabulae, (from his Genealogiae), which are especially valuable on account of the employment of the tragic literature of the Greeks, but which we have in an abridged form and unclassical diction; and four books de astronomia from Alexandrine sources, in a better text, but also abridged. Both works are no doubt by the

same writer; but it is doubtful whether by the Augustan writer Julius Hyginus.

1. Suet. gramm. 20: C. Iulius Hyginus, Augusti libertus, natione Hispanus — nonnulli Alexandrinum putant et a Caesare puerum Romam adductum Alexandria capta (a. 707) — studiose et audiit et imitatus est Cornelium Alexandrum grammaticum graecum, quem propter antiquitatis notitiam Polyhistorem multi . . vocabant. (Hence perhaps Hyginus is styled Alexandrinus). Praefuit palatinae bybliothecae (founded a. 726), nec eo secius plurimos docuit; fuitque familiarissimus Ovidio poetae (who addressed Trist. III 14 perhaps to him) et Clodio Licino (above 254, 6), . . qui eum admodum pauperem decessisse tradit. . . Huius libertus fuit Iulius Modestus, in studiis atque doctrina vestigia patroni secutus. This is carelessly excerpted by Jerome on Euseb. chron. ad a. Abr. 2008 = Aug. 35 = 746 v. c.: C. Iulius Hyginus, cognomento Polyhistor, grammaticus habetur inlustris. When Columella (I 1, 13 sq.) wrote, Hyginus was already dead. As early as in Festus v. orba (p. 182 a), Yginus is quoted together with Aelius Gallus and Cornificius. Chr. B. Bunte, de C. Iulii Hygini . . vita et scriptis, Pars prior, Marburg 1846. 63 pp.; also in his edition of the Fabulae p. 1—16.

2. Ascon. ad Cic. Pis. p. 13 Or.: Varronem tradere . . Iulius Hyginus dicit in libro priore de viris claris. Gell. I 14, 1: Iulius Hyginus in libro de vita rebusque inlustrium virorum sexto. This indicates two divisions (as above 122, 4) or (as in the case of Varro's Antiquitates and Imagines, above p. 244) two editions, a shorter and a longer. In the latter, a separate book seems to have been devoted to each character; hence Gell. VI 1, 2 (and 6): et C. Oppius (above 184, 2) et Iulius Hyginus aliique qui de vita et rebus Africani scripserunt. Cf. Hieronymus, above 202, 2. Gell. X 18, 7: Hyginus in Exemplis refert (cf. above 185, 3 and 4). Serv. Aen. V 389; secundum Hyginum, qui de familiis troianis scripsit (with Varro, above p. 243, c). Macrob. III 4, 13: Hyginus in libro quem de dis penatibus scripsit. III 8, 4: Hyginus De proprietatibus deorum, cum de astris ac de stellis loqueretur, ait etc. Cf. Non. Marc. v. Picumnus. From this (or from the Genealogiae, see n. 5) may be derived what Paulin. Nol. carm. 36, 131—143 states as Hyginus' view on Vesta. Serv. Aen. III 553: secundum Hyginum, qui scripsit De situ urbium italicarum; cf. ib. I 277. 530. VII 412 (H. in ital. urb.). VIII 597 and 600 (in urb. it.). VII 678 (de urb. it.). VIII 638 (de origine urbium it.). Macrob. V 18, 16 (Iulius Hyg. in libro II Urbium) cf. ib. 7, 19 (ut Hyginus Protarchum Trallianum secutus tradit).

3. Charis. I p. 115 P. = 142, 15 K.: Hyginus de agricultura II. Cf. Colum. I 1, 13: nec postremo quasi paedagogi eius (of Virgil in the Georg.) meminisse dedignemur, Iulii Hygini. . . non minorem tamen laudem meruerunt nostrorum temporum viri, Cornelius Celsus etc. III 11, 8: Hyginus, secutus Tremellium (above 147, 2). XI 2, 83. 3, 62.

Pliny who mentions him in his list of sources on b. III—VI, and X—XXII (always as Hyg.), quotes him especially h. n. XIII 47. XVI 84. XVIII 63. XIX 27. XX 45. XXI 29. He also wrote separately on bees, or this may have formed part of his work on agriculture. Colum. IX 13, 8: Hyginus in eo libro quem de apibus scripsit; cf. ib. 6. 11, 5 (H., auctoritatem Graecorum sequens). 13, 3 sq. 14, 1—18. Plin. n. h. XX 45, 116. On the character of this work see Colum. IX 2, 1 sq.: de quibus (bee-hives) neque diligentius quidquam praecipi potest quam ab Hygino iam dictum est nec ornatius quam Vergilio nec elegantius quam Celso. Hyginus veterum auctorum placita secretis dispersa monimentis industrie collegit. . . ea quae Hyginus fabulose tradita de originibus apum non intermisit poeticae magis licentiae quam nostrae fidei concesserim.

4. Charis. I p. 108 P. = 134 K.: Iulius Hyginus in Cinnae propemptico (see above 210, 2). Gellius XVI 6, 14 (on Aen. IV 57): Hyginus Iulius, qui ius pontificum non videtur ignorasse, in quarto librorum quos de Vergilio fecit. Hence also Macrob. VI 9, 7: Hyginus, qui ius pontificium non ignoravit, in quinto librorum quos de Vergilio fecit. Gellius I 21, 2: Hyginus, non hercle ignobilis grammaticus, in commentariis quae in Vergilium fecit, states that Georg. II 245 in libro qui fuerit ex domo atque ex familia Vergilii he found amaror. VII 6, 2 sqq. Gellius defends Virgil against the censure of Iulius Hyginus (concerning praepes), and X 16 alleges a number of objections made to the Aeneid by Hyginus in order to show that it had never been completed. (1: reprehendit Hyginus Vergilium correcturumque eum fuisse existimat. 11: item hoc quoque in eodem libro reprehendit et correcturum fuisse Vergilium putat nisi mori occupasset. 14: item in his versibus errasse Vergilium dicit. 18: versus . . quem Vergilius procul dubio exempturus fuit). See also Serv. on Aen. II 15. VII 47. XII 120. Bunte p. 22—33. Ribbeck, Prolegg. Vergil. p. 117—121.

5. Hygin. poet. astr. II 12: de quo in primo libro Genealogiarum scripsimus. This quotation suits fab. p. 29, 6 Bte.; the first part of the fabulae is on genealogy and certainly contains excerpts from Hyginus' Genealogiae. Dosith. *Ἑρμηνεύματα* libr. III p. 65 ed. Böcking: Maximo et Apro coss. (A. D. 207) a. d. III id. Sept. Hygini genealogiam omnibus notam descripsi, in qua erunt (erant emended by Bursian p. 769) plures historiae interpretatae in hoc libro = *Μαξίμῳ καὶ Ἄπρῳ ὑπάτοις πρὸ γ' εἰδῶν Σεπτεμβρίων Ὑγίνου γενεαλογίαν πᾶσιν γνωστὴν μετέγραψα, ἐν ᾗ ἔσονται πλείονες ἱστορίαι διηρμηνευμέναι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ.* A comparison of what Dositheus gives with the extant fabulae of Hyginus (Bunte, Hyg. fab. p. 18 sq. Lange, de nexu p. 6—8) proves the identity, but also the fact that Dositheus used a copy of the Genealogiae which was interpolated and considerably increased with additions from other writers (though Hyginus himself seems to have used Nigidius). It appears, therefore, that Hyginus was used as a school-author in the age of Dositheus. From the genealogical part which resembles a catalogue we should distinguish the parts containing narratives, in a connected style, and as is seems generally taken from the

argumenta of Greek tragedies. This second part does not seem to be taken from Hyginus' genealogiae, especially as repetitions and discrepancies frequently occur between these two parts (Bursian p. 771 sq.). The title of Fabulae was given to the work (by Micyllus) with special reference to this second part. Besides these sources, the author has also drawn upon the epic poets of the Greeks, Homer, Hesiod, the Cyclic and Alexandrine poets (Lange p. 25—63), and some parts (fab. 273) he takes from Virgil. The work has also much to connect it with Ovid; yet the deviations from him render any use of his works unlikely and rather prove that both employed the same sources, indeed Ovid did not use Hyginus (Lange p. 68); cf. n. 7. There are many mistakes as to mythological names, Lange p. 19—25; cf. Bursian p. 784. Besides the two palimpsest leaves saec. V or VI (discovered by Niebuhr in the Vatican library and edited Rome 1820), the work has been preserved in only one ms. (Bursian's program, 1868, p. VII—IX) the now lost Frisingensis (saec. IX?) of J. Micyllus (Bursian ib. p. IV—VII). On recently discovered fragments of this ms. see C. Halm, Munich 1870. 10 pp. (Trans. of the Bavarian Academy). Owing to a change of leaves, fol. 138—163 seem to have been removed to the middle from the beginning (Bu[illegible], Fab. p. 17. Lange p. 14. 30. Bursian p. 773 sq.). — Editions by Micyllus (Basileae 1535 and 1549. fol.), Commelinus (Heidelberg 1599), J. Schefler (Hygini quae hodie exstant etc. Hamburg 1674, with a treatise de Hygini scriptoris fabularum aetate atque stilo), Tho. Muncker (Mythographi latini, Amsterdam 1681), van Staveren (Auctores mythogr. lat., Lugd. Bat. 1742), Bernh. Bunte (Hyg. fabulae ed., Lips. s. a., 1857). Cf. Bunte's praef. p. 22—25. C. Lange de nexu inter C. Iulii Hygini opera mythologica et fabularum qui nomen eius praefert librum. accedunt fabulae transmutationum selectae (p. 69—74), Mayence 1865. K. Bursian in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 93, p. 761—784 and Ex Hygini Genealogiis excerpta . . restituta, Zürich 1868. 4. E. Wölfflin, Contributions to the criticism of Hyginus' fables, Philologus X p. 308—309. M. Schmidt, ibid. XXIII p. 47—71. XXV p. 416—433; Rhein. Mus. XX p. 459—462.

6. The work generally entitled Poetica astronomica bears in the mss. the headings de astronomia, de ratione sphaerae or similar ones; see Bursian l. l. p. 761 sq. n. 1. It is dedicated to an otherwise unknown person, M. Fabius, who is thus addressed in the preface: etsi te studio grammaticae artis inductum non solum versuum moderatione . . sed historiarum quoque varietate . . praestare video, . . tamen . . ne nihil in adolescentia laborasse dicerer et imperitorum iudicio desidiae subirem crimen, hoc velut rudimento scientiae scripsi ad te. Then follows the table of contents. After this we read: in his igitur tam multis et variis rebus non erit mirum aut pertimescendum quod tantum numerum versuum scripserimus; . . quodsi longior in sermone visus fuero, non mea facunditate, sed rei necessitate factum existimato. . . etenim praeter nostram scriptionem sphaerae quae fuerunt ab Arato obscurius dicta persecuti planius ostendimus. . . quodsi vel optimis

usus auctoribus effeci ut neque brevius neque verius diceret quispiam etc. ideoque maioribus etiam niti laboribus cogitamus. . . etenim necessariis nostris hominibus scientissimis maximas res scripsimus, non levibus occupati rebus populi captamus existimationem. The sources he used are especially Eratosthenes and the Scholia on Aratus, but we meet with the traces of great hurry (Bursian p. 765 sq.). Claudius Ptolemaeus does not appear to be known to this writer, but Cicero's translation of Aratus is quoted III 29 and IV 3. It cannot be shown that the work was employed by Pliny. The end of the work is not complete. There are several mss. of saec. IX sqq., in the Vatican library, at Berne, St. Gallen, Wolfenbüttel, Brussels, Paris, Montpellier and elsewhere. In the editions (ed. princeps, Ferrar. 1475. 4.) this work is generally joined to the Fabulae, especially in the Mythographi of Commelinus, Muncker and van Staveren; see n. 5. Kiehl, Mnemosyne II p. 88 sqq. L. W. Hasper, Hyginus philosophus de imaginibus coeli, i. e. the third book of the poet. astr. of C. Iulius Hyginus, edited for the first time (?) from a Paris ms. Leipzig 1861. See Bursian, Lit. Centralbl. 1861, p. 854 sq. and l. l. p. 785, n. 46.

7. The identity of the author of the Genealogiae and of the Astronomia cannot be doubted; see n. 5 in. Nor does ever any other name occur but Hyginus. But the question is: Is he the Augustan writer? The awkward boastful style of the preface to the Astronomia (see n. 6), and the tiro-like mistakes in both works do not harmonize with the idea we should like to form of the (subsequent?) director of the Palatine Library. The fact of no quotations being found of any works by the latter, is of little consequence, seeing how accidental and incomplete these mentions are; nor does it matter that their author is never explicitly named Iulius Hyg., which is also the case with other works (see n. 3). It being, moreover, certain of the Genealogiae that they were, at an early time, abridged and altered for school-purposes (we have three redactions of different tenor in Dositheus, Niebuhr's leaves and the text of Micyllus) and that they contained part of de rerum inventione, and as, moreover, we cannot prove the employment of Post-Augustan authors, and we should not wonder that a foreigner dealt rather awkwardly with the Latin language, it would be preposterous to say that it was impossible that both works were early compositions by Iulius Hyginus. At all events, the author of these works is not identical with the gromatic writer Hyginus (Bursian p. 767). Bursian (Fleck.'s Jahrb. 93 p. 773) forms the following conception of the whole matter: "Perhaps in the second half of the second century of the Christian era a grammarian made a very brief abridgment of Hyginus' work entitled Genealogiae, and which dealt with cosmogony and theogony in rather an elaborate manner, and to this he added (fabb. 164 sqq.) a treatise on the whole mythology as far as it concerned poetical literature, arranged according to mythological views (heroic legends according to the various legendary cycles, *μεταμορφώσεις, αἴτια*), apparently from good sources. This handbook of

mythology, which retained the name of Hyginus and the title of Genealogiae from its first part, soon came to be generally used in the schools of the grammarians and in consequence of this employment (which was continued during several centuries) underwent various changes, partly by altering the diction and admitting transpositions . . . partly by additions and augmentations".

258. Besides this writer, the Augustan period possessed still a considerable number of less important grammarians and professors, most of whom were also busy in literature. Such were Caecilius Epirota, L. Crassitius, Scribonius Aphrodisius, and others. Tarquitius Priscus, whose works on Etruscan vaticination retained their authority for long afterwards, may be added to this epoch, if indeed he was not earlier. Clodius Tuscus and Cornelius Labeo were writers of a similar kind. Only an astronomical calendar by Clodius Tuscus is extant in the Greek translation of Laurentius Lydus. The works bearing the name of the physician Antonius Musa are of later origin.

1. Suet. gramm. 16: Q. Caecilius Epirota, Tusculi natus, libertus Attici (above 159, 1), . . cum filiam patroni nuptam M. Agrippae (above 217, 10) doceret, suspectus in ea et ob hoc remotus ad Cornelium Gallum (above 227) se contulit vixitque una familiarissime, quod ipsi Gallo inter gravissima crimina ab Augusto obicitur. post deinde damnationem mortemque Galli scholam aperuit, sed ita ut paucis et tantum adolescentibus praeciperet, praetextato nemini. . . primus dicitur latine ex tempore disputasse primusque Vergilium et alios poetas novos praelegere coepisse.

2. Suet. gramm. 18: L. Crassitius, genere Tarentinus ordinis libertini, cognomine Pasicles, mox Pansam se transnominavit. hic initio circa scenam versatus est (above 8, 1), . . deinde in pergula docuit, donec commentario Zmyrnae (above 210, 2) . . inclaruit. . . sed cum . . doceret iam multos ac nobiles, in his Iulum Antonium (above 237, 3), ut Verrio quoque Flacco compararetur, dimissa repente schola transiit ad Q. Sexti philosophi sectam.

3. Suet. gramm. 19: Scribonius Aphrodisius, Orbili (above 187, 3) servus atque discipulus, mox a Scribonia, . . quae prior Augusti uxor fuerat, redemptus et manumissus docuit quo Verrius tempore, cuius etiam libris de orthographia rescripsit etc. (above 256, 2).

4. Festus v. topper (p. 352 b): topper significare ait Artorius cito, fortasse etc. Quintil. I. O. IX 1, 2: nec desunt qui tropis figurarum nomen imponant, quorum est C. Artorius Proculus.

5. Macrob. III 20, 3: Tarquitius Priscus in Ostentario arborario sic ait. Cf. ib. 7, 2: est super hoc liber Tarquitii transscriptus

ex Ostentario tusco. Pliny in the Ind. auct. of b. II: ex . . . Caecina (above 196, 13) qui de etrusca disciplina scripsit, Tarquitio qui item. Lyd. de ostent. 1: (*χρησόμεθα δὲ καὶ*) *Ταρκύτῳ τῷ* (*τελεστῇ*? O. Müller, *Ταρκυτίῳ τῷ Θύσκῳ*). Amm. Marcell. XXV 2, 7 (A. D. 363): etrusci haruspices . . . ex Tarquitianis libris in titulo de rebus divinis id relatum esse monstrantes. Lactant. div. inst. I 10, 2: hunc (Aesculap.) Tarquitius, de illustribus viris disserens, ait incertis parentibus natum etc. From his work may be derived Serv. Verg. Ecl. IV 43 (= Macrob. III 7, 2). He is probaby meant by Festus v. ratitum (p. 274 a. M.): Tarqui (→ follows a gap). In Virgil, Catal. 7, 3, he is mentioned together with Stilo and Varro as the representatives of the scholasticorum natio. But L. Tarquitius L. f. Pomp. Etruscus Sulpicianus, scriba quaestor. in Orelli 1189 (a Roman inscription) is probably much later.

6. Serv. Aen. I 176: Clodius scribit, commentariorum quarto. Cf. I 52 (Clodius commentariorum). II 229 (Clodius scriba comm.). XII 657 (Clodius Tuscus: mussare est ex graeco etc.). This Clodius Tuscus composed an astronomical calendar, which we possess in the Greek translation of Laurentius Lydus (de ostentis p. 114 sqq. Wachsm.). The heading is: *ἐφημερὶς τοῦ παντὸς ἐνιαυτοῦ, ἤγουν σημείωσις ἐπιτολῶν τε καὶ δυσμῶν τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ φαινομένων, ἐκ τῶν Κλαυδίου τοῦ Θούσκου καθ' ἑρμηνείαν πρὸς λέξιν;* cf. p. 155: *καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Κλώδιος ἐκ τῶν παρὰ Θούσκοις ἱερῶν πρὸς λέξιν.* From the frequent agreement of this calendar with the dates in Ovid's Fasti, Merkel (Ovid. Fast. p. LXVI—LXXIV) concludes that Ovid's chief source was this work of Clodius Tuscus, and that Tuscus composed it for Ovid. Gell. V 20, 2: Sinnius Capito in litteris (on points of grammar) quas ad Clodium Tuscum dedit. He is perhaps the same as Tuscus whom Ovid (ex Ponto IV 16, 20; comp. above 247, 8) mentions as a poet. On the historicus Tuscus see below 272, 4. A certain Fabricius Tuscus is mentioned by Pliny in his list of authorities in b. IV and VI (on geography).

7. The literary works of Cornelius Labeo, whose time is unknown, bear a similar character. Macrob. I 16, 29: Cornelius Labeo primo Fastorum libro; cf. 12, 21 (agreeing with Festus v. Maius, p. 134 M., perhaps because Labeo availed himself of Verrius Flaccus). III 4, 6 (Cornelius Labeo de dis penatibus eadem existimat). I 18, 21: Cornelius Labeo in libro cui titulus est De oraculo Apollinis Clarii. He is probably identical with Labeo in libris qui appellantur De dis animalibus ap. Serv. Aen. III 168 cf. I 378 (alii, ut Nigidius et Labeo, deos penates . . tradunt), and perhaps with Labeo ap. Augustin. civ. dei II 11 (cum Labeo, quem huiuscemodi rerum peritissimum praedicant, numina bona . . etiam cultus diversitate distinguat). 14 (Platonem Labeo inter semideos commemorandum putavit). III 25. VIII 13. IX 19 (nonnulli istorum . . daemonicolarum, in quibus et Labeo est, eosdem perhibent ab aliis angelos dici quos ipsi daemones nuncupant, — which would lead us to infer that this Labeo belonged to the Christian era), and possibly the *Λαβεὼν* whom Lyd. de mens. IV 1, 20 and de ostent.

3 extr. 42 mentions with the heading: *καθολικὴ ἐπιτήρησις πρὸς σελήνην περὶ κεραυνῶν καὶ ἄλλων καταστημάτων, ἐκ τῶν Λαβεῶνος καθ' ἑρμηνείαν πρὸς λέξιν ἀπὸ τῆς θερμῆς τροπῆς:* cf. C. Wachsmuth's Prolegg. p. XXII sq. The fictitious Fulgentius (expos. serm. ant. s. v. manales, p. 769 Stav.): Labeo, qui disciplinas etruscas Tagetis et Bacchetidis XV voluminibus explicavit. On the other hand, he seems to be identical with Cornelius (the mss. Cornilius) who quattuor Mercurios esse scribit, in Schol. Stat. Theb. IV 482, a fact generally stated of quidam or nonnulli; see Serv. Aen. I 297. IV 577. Ampel. 9 (p. 10, 5 Wn.). Mythogr. Vat. II 42. O. Jahn, Rhein. Mus. IX p. 627.

8. In the time of Augustus grammatical works were also written by M. Messala (above 218, 10), Antonius Rufus (above 249, 5 fin.), Cornificius (above 206, 2 fin.); works on antiquities were produced by Cincius (above 106, 4) and Fenestella (above 254, 2), on natural history by Pompeius Trogus (above 253, 2) and Sabinus Tiro (above 52, 4).

9. Macrob. III 18, 7: vir doctus Oppius, in libro quem fecit De silvestribus arboribus; so also ib. 19, 4. He is probably the same as Oppius whom Pliny quotes in his ind. auct. on b. XI (on zoology).

10. Of the physician Antonius Musa (Pauly's Encycl. I 1 p. 1188 sq. nr. 65) we often hear what remedies he employed (e. g. Plin. N. H. XXX 39 and in Galenus), but in a manner which does not justify the inference of extant works by him; see E. Meyer, Hist. of Botany II p. 48—52, who pronounces the writer on remedies in Greek mentioned by Galen. XII p. 989 K. to be identical with Petronius Musa (+ c. 50 A. D.). Under the name of Antonius Musa we possess a treatise de herba betonica (with prescriptions addressed to M. Agrippa). A Leyden ms., saec. VI, of this work is described by L. Müller, Rh. Mus. XXIII p. 189 (at the end: explicit herbarium Antonini Musae de herba vettonica). There is also a fragment de tuenda valitudine ad Maecenatem; see Antonii Musae fragmenta quae extant collegit Flor. Caldani, Bassano 1800.

259. The architect Vitruvius Pollio dedicated in his later years to Augustus his ten books de architectura, in which this subject-matter is treated in its widest sense. The author appears to possess varied education and learning and a reflecting mind; yet he had not acquired refined culture and taste. In point of its subject, this work (the only one of its kind which we possess) is very important, but its form is repulsive and crotchety. Besides the original work we possess also an abridgment made by an unknown author.

1. Personal circumstances. The work itself gives us only the name of Vitruvius, his cognomen has the authority of the epitome (see n. 5). The praenomen has been variously chosen by the Italian scholars

of the 15th century, owing to various conjectures. The assumption that Vitruvius was a native of Verona, rests solely on the inscription found there (Orelli 4145): L. Vitruvius L. l. Cerdo. Only the statements of Vitruvius himself are trustworthy, especially those in the preface to b. I, which looks like a paraphrase of the beginning of Hor. Epist. II 1 in the peculiar taste of Vitruvius: cum divina tua mens et numen, imperator Caesar (Augustus), imperio potiretur orbis terrarum invictaque virtute cunctis hostibus stratis, triumpho (August 725) victoriaque tua cives gloriarentur . . populusque rom. et senatus liberatus timore amplissimis tuis cogitationibus consiliisque gubernaretur, non audebam tantis occupationibus de architectura scripta . . edere, metuens ne non apto tempore interpellans subirem tui animi offensionem (cf. Hor. S. II 1, 20. Ep. I 13, 4 sq. II 1, 220 sq.). cum vero attenderem te etc. . . ut civitas per te non solum provinciis esset aucta (Egypt 724, Galatia 729) verum etiam etc. non putavi praetermittendum quin . . ea tibi ederem, ideo quod primum parenti tuo (Caesar) de eo fueram notus et eius virtutis studiosus. cum autem . . imperium parentis in tuam potestatem transtulisset, idem studium meum in eius memoria permanens in te contulit favorem. itaque cum M. Aurelio et P. Minidio et Gn. Cornelio ad apparationem ballistarum et scorpionum reliquorumque tormentorum refectionem fui praesto et cum eis commoda accepi. quae cum primo mihi tribuisti, recognitionem per sororis (Octavia, † 743) commendationem servasti. cum ergo eo beneficio essem obligatus ut ad exitum vitae non haberem inopiae timorem, haec tibi scribere coepi, quod animadverti multa te aedificasse et nunc aedificare. He mentions the pronaus aedis Augusti V 1, 7 (p. 107, 3 R). Reference to Caesar is made II 9, 15 sq. (59, 18 sqq. R.): divus Caesar cum exercitum habuisset circa Alpes etc. with a detailed description such as an eyewitness would give; VIII 3, 25 (p. 203, 11 sqq. R): G. Iulius, Masinissae filius, . . cum patre Caesari militavit (a. 708). is hospitio meo est usus. He always addresses Augustus as Imperator or Caesar, but knows also the title of Augustus which had been awarded to him a. 727. The mention he makes of the numerous buildings of Augustus also leads us beyond a. 727, and even beyond 738, at which time the temple of Quirinus was built at Rome, Vitruv. III 2, 7 (p. 70, 4): dipteros . . est aedis Quirini dorico. On the other hand, Vitruv. III 2, 2 speaks only of a single stone theatre at Rome, while a. 741 two more were built. Hence the work appears to have been composed about a. 740. A. Hirt, in Wolf's Mus. of the Study of Antiquities I (1806) p. 228 sq.

2. On the character of the work. Vitr. II, prooem. 5: mihi autem, Imperator, staturam non tribuit natura, faciem deformavit aetas, valetudo detraxit vires. itaque quoniam ab his praesidiis sum desertus per auxilia scientiae scriptaque, ut spero, perveniam ad commendationem. VI prooem. 4 sq.: cum et parentium cura et praeceptorum doctrinis auctas haberem copias disciplinarum philologis et philotechnis rebus commentariorumque scripturis me delectans eas possessiones animo

paravi e quibus haec est fructuum summa, . . nihil desiderare. . . ego, Caesar, non ad pecuniam parandam ex arte dedi studium. . . ideo notities parum est adsecuta, sed tamen his voluminibus editis, ut spero, etiam posteris ero notus. neque est mirandum quid ita pluribus sim ignotus. ceteri architecti rogant et ambiunt ut architectentur, mihi autem a praeceptoribus est traditum rogatum, non rogantem, oportere suscipere curam. I 1, 17: peto, Caesar, et a te et ab is qui ea volumina sunt lecturi ut si quid parum ad regulam artis grammaticae fuerit explicatum ignoscatur. namque non uti summus philosophus nec rhetor disertus nec grammaticus . ., sed ut architectus his litteris imbutus haec nisus sum scribere. But he is fond, especially in the garrulous introductions he prefixes to each book (Schneider's ed. I p. LIII—LXVII), of displaying his knowledge in philosophy and history, though frequently with small success, e. g. VI prooem. 3: non minus poetae qui antiquas comoedias graece scripserunt easdem sententias verbis in scena pronuntiaverunt, ut Eucrates, Chionides, Aristophanes, maxime etiam cum his Alexis. He declares his purpose to be brief V, prooem. 3: cum animadvertissem distentam occupationibus civitatem publicis et privatis negotiis, paucis iudicavi scribendum, uti angusto spatio vacuitatis ea legentes breviter percipere possent, and again ib. 5: cum ergo . . animo advertam inusitatas et obscuras multis res esse mihi scribendas, quo facilius ad sensus legentium pervenire possint, brevibus voluminibus iudicavi scribere.

3. Vitruvius himself states at great length the contents of the single books (volumina) at the beginning and close of each. The first seven books treat of architecture proper (ecclesiastical and private building). The eighth book treats of water and aqueducts, the ninth of instruments for measuring time (sun-dials), the tenth of machines, uti totum corpus omnia architecturae membra in decem voluminibus habeat explicata (X 22, 12). I 1, 3 he wants an architect to take care ut litteratus sit, peritus graphidos, eruditus geometria, historias complures noverit, philosophos diligenter audierit, musicam scierit, medicinae non sit ignarus, responsa iurisconsultorum noverit, astrologiam coelique rationes cognitas habeat. Vitruvius' principal sources were Greek writers, whom he chiefly enumerates VII prooem. 11—14 with the declaration: quorum ex commentariis quae utilia esse . . animadverti collecta in unum coegi corpus. But his knowledge of Greek is deficient, in spite of such bold formations as *ἀνιατρολόγητος*. He frequently does not succeed in expressing himself intelligibly; he lacks both the talent and routine of an author. His style is sometimes immoderately garrulous, sometimes unduly brief, now strangely got up and affected, now plebeian (e. g. calefaciuntur and his wrong use of the plupf.)

4. Only two of the existing mss., as Rose has pointed out, possess independent value, the Harleian (H) saec. IX and the Gudianus (G) saec. XI. Both, however, are derived from the same original, as they have the same gaps and errors, and the same transposition of leaves.

VII 6. The period of the Harleian ms. is of itself sufficient to refute the opinion of C. Fr. L. Schultz (Essay on the age of . . Vitruvius, edited by O. Schultz, Leipzig 1856. 55 pp.), that the work was composed in the tenth century, if not as late as the 13th; another argument is that Pliny mentions Vitruvius among his sources in b. XVI, XXXV and XXXVI (ex Vitruvio), and that in some places it may be proved that he used the extant work; see H. Brunn, de indic. Plin. (Bonn 1856. 4.) p. 57—60. See also Serv. Aen. VI 43: Vitruvius, qui de architectonica scripsit, . . ostium dicit.

5. The abridgment (by an auctor satis antiquus, according to Rose), bears in the mss. the heading: De diversis fabricis architectonicae, and begins: De artis architectonicae peritia multa oratione Vitruvius Polio aliique auctores scientissime scripsere. verum ne longa eorum disertaque facundia humilioribus ingeniis alienum faceret studium, pauca ex his mediocri licet sermone privatis usibus ornare fuit consilium. The arrangement of Vitruvius has been kept unchanged, but the subject limited to private buildings. At the end an explanation of horologium pelecinum and hemicyclium is added from another source; even c. 30 (on maltae) is taken from some other source and of later origin. The whole composition has been edited from three mss. saec. X by Rose p. 285—313. Cf. ib. p. XII.

6. Editions of Vitruvius. See Schneider's edition I p. XI—XXVIII. Ed. princeps by Jo. Sulpicius s. l. et a. (Rome between 1484 and 1492), fol. An arbitrary revision of the text by Jo. Jucundus, Ven. 1511. fol. Cum comm. G. Philander, Lugd. Bat. 1552. 4. Cum notis variorum ed. Io. de Laet, Amsterd. 1649. fol. (with Baldi's Lex. Vitruv.). Cum vers. ital. ed. B. Galiani, Neapel 1758. fol. Ed. illustr. A. Rode, Berlin 1800. 2 vols. 4. Rec., emend., illustr. I. G. Schneider, Lips. 1807 sq. 3 vols. Cum notis varr. ed. Stratico, Udine 1825—1830, 4 vols. 4. An edition with large collections by A. Marini, Rom 1836. 4 vols. fol. Rec. atque emend. et in germ. vertit C. Lorentzen, I 1. Gotha 1856. Ad antiquiss. codd. nunc primum ediderunt Val. Rose et Herm. Müller-Strübing, Lips. (Teubner) 1867.

7. German translations. Erstmahls verteutscht durch G. H. Rivium, Nürnberg 1548. fol.; with numerous woodcuts Basle 1614. fol. By A. Rode, Leipzig 1796. 4. 2 vols.; plates and notes, Berlin 1801. fol. Translated and explained in notes and plates by Fr. Reber, Stuttgart (Hoffmann) 1864 sq. 12.

French translations (with notes) par J. Martin (Paris 1547. fol.), Cl. Perrault (Paris 1673. 1684. fol.). With text and atlas, by Tardieu and Cousin (Paris 1839. 4.); par Maufras (Paris 1847 sqq. 2 vols.).

English translations by W. Newton (London 1771—1791. 2 vols. fol., with 47 plates), Wilkins (London 1813. 2 vols. fol.).

Italian translations by Bald. Orsini (Perugia 1802. 2 vols.), Quir. Viviani and Vinc. Tuzzi (Udine 1830).

8. On the explanation of Vitruvius see B. Baldus, de verborum Vitruv. significatione, Augsburg 1614. 4. J. Polenus, Exercitationes Vitruvianae, Padua 1739. fol. 1741. fol. H. C. Genelli, explanatory letters on Vitruv., Brunswick 1801. Berlin 1804. 4. J. Rösch, Explanations of Vitr., Stuttgart 1802. Haubold, Exercitationes Vitr., Lips. 1821. 4. C. Lorentzen, Observationes criticae ad Vitr., Gotha 1858. 4. Vitr. X 13—15 in Köchly and Rüstow's Greek military writers. I (Leipzig 1853). p. 347—405. E. H. F. Meyer, History of Botany. I. (Königsberg 1854.) p. 382—391.

9. On the modulus of Vitruvius (the unit in his statements concerning the proportions of an ancient temple) see Aurès, nouvelle théorie du module, Nimes 1862 (the diameter of the column at its average vertical height), and against him Fr. Reber, Philologus XXVII p. 185—191 (the diameter of the lower end of the column proper).

260. Among the jurists of the Augustan age the two most important are Labeo and Capito. M. Antistius Labeo's (c. 695—765) legal knowledge was based on comprehensive culture and supported by a character of unconquerable firmness which no less than his numerous legal works contributed to maintain his name in respectful and honourable remembrance. His antipode was the monarchist C. Ateius Capito (a. 720—776), who did not come up to Labeo in scientific importance and literary activity. To the same period belong Blaesus, a pupil of Trebatius', and probably also the jurist Fabius Mela.

1. Pompon. Dig. I 2, 2, 47: post hunc (Aelius Tubero, above 205, 1) maximae auctoritatis fuerunt Ateius Capito, qui Ofilium secutus est, et Antistius Labeo, qui omnes hos (all professors of law of that period, see above 189 and 205) audivit, institutus est autem a Trebatio (above 189, 3). ex his Ateius consul fuit (a. 758 v. c. = 5 A. D.), Labeo noluit, cum offerretur ei ab Augusto consulatus, quo suffectus fieret, honorem suscipere, sed plurimis studiis operam dedit et totum annum ita diviserat ut Romae sex mensibus cum studiosis esset (and consulentibus de iure publice responsitaret, Gell. XIII 10, 1), sex mensibus secederet (probably to his fundus Gallianus, see Gell. XIII 12, 4) et conscribendis libris operam daret. itaque reliquit quadringenta volumina, ex quibus plurima inter manus versantur. hi duo primum veluti diversas sectas fecerunt (see above p. 62 and p. 370 sq.); nam . . Labeo ingenii qualitate et fiducia doctrinae, qui et ceteris operis sapientiae operam dederat, plurima innovare instituit (above p. 371, n. 1). Gellius XIII 10, 1: Labeo Antistius iuris quidem civilis disciplinam principali studio exercuit, . . sed ceterarum quoque bonarum artium non expers fuit et in grammaticam sese atque dialecticam literasque

antiquiores altioresque penetraverat latinarumque vocum origines rationesque percalluerat eaque praecipue scientia ad enodandos plerosque iuris laqueos utebatur. The example given ib. 3 (soror non seorsum) proves him to have been a purist (above p. 51, 5.) Tac. A. III 75: to Capito consulatum adceleraverat Augustus, ut Labeonem Antistium, isdem artibus praecellentem, dignatione eius magistratus anteiret. namque illa aetas duo pacis decora simul tulit. sed Labeo incorrupta libertate et ob id fama celebratior, Capitonis obsequium dominantibus magis probabatur. illi quod praeturam intra stetit commendatio ex iniuria, huic quod consulatum adeptus est odium ex invidia oriebatur. Gell. XIII 12, 1 sq.: in quadam epistula Atei Capitonis scriptum legimus Labeonem Antistium legum atque morum populi rom. iurisque civilis doctum adprime fuisse. sed agitabat, inquit, hominem libertas quaedam nimia atque vecors, tamquam eorum divo Augusto iam principe et remp. obtinente ratum tamen pensumque nihil haberet nisi quod iustum sanctumque esse in romanis antiquitatibus legisset. Less servility, in spite of a greater personal claim, appears in Porphyrio on Hor. S. I 3, 82 (p. 70 H.): Marcus Antistius Labeo praetorius, iuris etiam peritus, memor libertatis in qua natus erat multa contumaciter adversus Caesarem dixisse et fecisse dicitur, propter quod Horatius nunc adulans Augusto insanum eum dicit. Cf. Acro ib. (p. 58 H.). If Horace l. l. (Labeone insanior inter sanos dicatur, from a. 716 or 717) actually relates to the son of his former comrade in war (above 199, 6), it should certainly not be understood of his political tendencies. On Labeo see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. I 1 p. 1163—1165, nr. 26.

2. Labeo's works included 400 books (see n. 1). The fragments from the Digest in Hommel, Palingenesia libr. iur. vat. (Lips. 1767) I p. 321—338; those from other authors in Huschke, iurispr. anteiust.[1] p. 43—48.[2] p. 44—50. Gell. XIII 10, 2: sunt libri post mortem eius editi, qui Posteriores inscribuntur, quorum librorum tres continui, XXXVIII et XXXIX et XL, pleni sunt id genus (see n. 1) rerum ad enarrandam et inlustrandam linguam latinam conducentium. In other respects the work was a system of civil law, arranged according to the design of Q. Mucius (above 141, 2). An abridgment was made by Iavolenus, which was employed in the Digest, just as the eight books Probabilium (*πιθανῶν*) were used in the epitome of Paulus. Both these works are on the whole quoted 63 times in the Digest. Labeo libris Epistolarum (Dig. XLI 3, 30, 1); libri responsorum, at least 15 books (Collat. XII 7, 3). Gell. XIII 10, 3: in libris quos ad praetoris edictum scripsit multa posuit partim lepide atque argute reperta. sicuti hoc est quod in quarto ad edictum libro scriptum legimus etc. Dig. L 16, 19: Labeo libro primo praetoris urbani; IV 3, 9, 4: Labeo libro trigesimo praetoris peregrini. Gell. I 12, 18: in commentariis Labeonis quae ad XII tabulas composuit; cf. ib. XX 1, 13 and VI (VII), 15, 1: Labeo in libro de XII tabulis secundo. Festus v. prov. (p. 253[a]): Labeo de iure pontificio l. XI; then v. penatis: Labeo Antistius, and v. proculiunt: Antistius de iure pontificali l. IX; v. spurcum (p. 348, where

he is also quoted in other respects): Labeo Antistius l. X commentarii iuris pontificii; v. sistere (p. 251 a): Antistius Labeo in commentario XV iuris pontifici. Perhaps also (de) officio augu(rum), ib. p. 290a. Gell. I 12, 1: qui de virgine capienda scripserunt, quorum diligentissime scripsit Labeo Antistius. Macrob. III 9, 4 (after a previous citation of Ateius Capito ex libro I de cura sacrificiorum): Labeo vero sexagesimo et octavo libro intulit etc. Notes on Labeo were written by the jurists Proculus, Aristo and others. C. Thomasius comparatio Labeonis et Capitonis, Lips. 1683. C. v. Eck, de vita . . Labeonis et . . Capitonis, Franeker 1692 and in Oelrich's thesaur. nov. I 2. p. 825—856. F. A. Biener, Ant. Labeo iuris civilis novator, in his opusc. (1830). I p. 196—213. Bach, historia iurisprud. rom. p. 403 sqq. S. W. Zimmern, History of Roman private law I 1 p. 306—311. A. F. Rudorff, Hist. of Roman law I p. 178 sq. 236. De Geer in the Verslagen en Med. d. k. Akad. v. Wetensch. XI. 1868. L. Borchert, num A. L. stoicae philosophiae fuerit addictus, Berlin 1869. 57 pp.

3. C. Ateius (C. I. lat. I p. 198, nr. 750 sq. Fasti praenest. ib. p. 474, XIII) Capito, principem in civitate locum studiis civilibus adsecutus, sed avo centurione Sullano, patre praetorio. consulatum ei adceleraverat Augustus etc. (n. 1), Tac. A. III 75. If this was said of the consulship of a. 758, Capito would appear to have been born c. a. 720. He was Curator aquarum from A. D. 13 to his death, a. 22 (Tac. l. l.), Frontin. aq. 102. As jurist he was a pupil of Ofilius' (above 189, 2), and in his quae ei tradita fuerant perseverabat (Pompon., see n. 1). Gellius X 20, 2: Ateius Capito, publici privatique iuris peritissimus. Macrob. VII 13, 11: apud Ateium Capitonem, pontificii iuris inter primos peritum. Tac. A. III 70: Capito insignitior infamia fuit (on account of his servility, cf. Suet. gramm. 22. Dio LVII 17), quod humani divinique iuris sciens egregium publicum et bonas domi artes dehonestavisset.

4. The works of Capito: Coniectanea (Gell. II 24, 2. 15. XX 2, 3; ib. IV 14, 1: cum librum VIII Atei Capitonis coniectaneorum legeremus, qui inscriptus est De iudiciis publicis; X 6, 4); liber de officio senatorio (Gell. IV 10, 7 sq.; perhaps b. IX of the Coniectanea, see ib. XIV 7, 12 sq.: quod Ateius Capito in Coniectaneis scriptum reliquit; nam in libro IX . . ait nullum senatusconsultum fieri posse etc. ib. 8, 2: Ateius Capito in Coniectaneorum IX ius esse praefecto senatus habendi dicit); de pontificio iure (b. V. ap. Gell. IV 6, 10; Capito Ateius in l. VII pontificali, Festus v. mundus, p. 154b; cf. Macrob. VII 13, 11 sqq.); Epistolae (Gell. XIII 12, 1 sqq. cf. note 1). Cf. Huschke, iurisprud. anteiust. [1] p. 48—56. [2] p. 50—58. This work is repeatedly quoted by Festus, and by Pliny in his list of authors in b. III, IV, XIV, XV, XVIII, probably from the Coniectanea. In the Digest we do not find by him a fragmentum purum, but several quotations at second hand. Zimmern, Hist. of Roman private law, I 1, p. 307 sq. Th. Frederking (and L. Mercklin), Philologus XIX p. 650—664. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. I 2 p. 1955 sq. nr. 4.

5. Labeo Dig. XXXIII 2, 31: Blaesus ait Trebatium respondisse etc. Majansius, Comm. II p. 162 sq.

6. Fabius Mela (Dig. XLIII 23, 1, 12) is in the Digest frequently quoted together with Labeo and Trebatius (XV 3, 7, 2 sq. XIX 2, 13, 8. 5, 20. XXVII 3, 1, 5 sq. XLVII 10, 17, 2), being probably a contemporary of theirs, especially as he himself quotes Aquilius Gallus (above 161, 1 sq.): Dig. XIX 1, 17, 6: Gallus Aquilius, cuius Mela refert opinionem. He wrote a Digest in at least 38 books (Dig. XLVII 2, 52, 30; cf. XLVI 3, 39 pr.: Mela libro X). Treatises De Fabio Mela by J. L. G. Beck (Lips. 1806. 4.) and H. E. Dirksen (Königsberg 1808. 4).

7. Vitellius, on whom Masurius Sabinus and Cassius Longinus wrote notes under Tiberius (see below 276, 1 and 3), appears to belong to the Augustan period, but is otherwise unknown, unless he be the rerum Augusti procurator Vitellius mentioned by Suet. Vitell. 2.

8. On Veranius see above 186, 14.

9. To the Augustan period we should probably attribute the pactum fiduciae found in Spain and which was entered into between Dama L. Titi ser(vos) and L. Baianius; see C. I. lat. II p. 700, nr. 5042: cf. E. Hübner Hermes III p. 283—289, and H. Degenkolb, Journal of Jurisprudence IX p. 117—180.

261. Interest in philosophy was generally evinced in the Augustan age, all writers of eminence, e. g. especially Virgil, Horace, and Livy, manifesting it, and in common with them also Labeo, Vitruvius, Varus, Lynceus, and others. Owing to the influence of the favourite system of Epicurus, this interest was now extended to the physical side, though ethics retained always the upper hand. Yet it never exceeded the limits of dilettantism, even with those who professed to write on philosophy, e. g. Augustus and Livy, and perhaps even with the Stoics Crispinus and Stertinius. A certain importance attaches only to Q. Sextius Niger, both father and son, whose adherents were Crassitius, Papirius Fabianus, and others; they wrote in Greek. The father, an energetic man of great moral severity, and an independent thinker, aimed at realizing his conception of moral worth in individual life; in the sentences which have come down to us under his name we meet, besides Stoic and Pythagorean doctrines, with Jewish and theistic tenets.

1. See above p. 391 sq. On Virgil's philosophical bent see above 220, 3; on Horace 230, 5; T. Livius 251, 4; Augustus 217, 3; Alfenus

Varus 205, 3; on the author of Ciris p. 422; on Lynceus 239, 3; P. Volumnius 250, 3; Labeo 260, 1. Seneca's mother Helvia would have liked to study philosophy, if her husband had allowed her; see below 264, 1.

2. Vitruv. I 1, 7: philosophia perficit architectum animo magno et uti non sit adrogans, sed potius facilis, aequus et fidelis sine avaritia etc. . . praeterea de rerum natura . . philosophia explicat, quam necesse est studiosius novisse, quod habet multas et varias naturales quaestiones, ut etiam in aquarum ductionibus . . quorum (i. e. spiritus naturales) offensionibus mederi nemo poterit nisi qui ex philosophia principia rerum naturae noverit. But even without a practical interest of this kind natural philosophy was much studied in this period in common with the ethic part by Iccius (Hor. O. I 29, 13 sq. Ep. I 12, 15 sqq.), the author of Ciris (Cir. 5 sqq. 11 sqq. 39 sqq.), Lynceus (Prop. III 32, 27 sq. 51 sqq.), and Manilius (Astr. I 96 sqq. 118 sqq. IV 866 sqq.). In the same way, Sextius Niger the elder (n. 5—7) and Papirius Fabianus (below n. 10 sq.), Celsus (below 275, 3 and 5), Seneca, Pliny the Elder and Suetonius display a connexion of philosophical and physical studies.

3. Porphyrio on Hor. S. I 1, 120 (p. 23 H.): Plotius Crispinus philosophiae studiosus fuit. idem et carmina scripsit, sed tam garrule ut aretalogus diceretur. Acro ib. (p. 16 H.): hic Crispinus poeta fuit, qui sectam stoicam versibus scripsit.

4. Acro on Hor. Ep. I 12, 20 (p. 434): Stertinius philosophus, qui CCXX libros Stoicorum latine scripsit. hos notat quod versibus suis obscuriorem philosophiam fecerint. The first statement which is in itself less plausible does not occur in Porphyrio, who says merely (p. 436): hunc et alibi tangit ut Stoicum qui de paradoxis loquitur, and on S. II 3, 33 (p. 270): Stertinius unus e Stoicis fuit, while Acro states (p. 237): fuit Stertinius de Stoicis.

5. Sen. Epist. 98, 13: honores reppulit pater Sextius, qui ita natus ut remp. deberet capessere latum clavum divo Iulio dante non recepit. Too late even for the son is the otherwise onesided statement of Hieronym. on Eus. Chr. a. Abr. 2017 = Aug. 44 = 755 v. c.: Sextus Pythagoricus philosophus nascitur. Sen. Epist. 59, 7: Sextium . . lego, virum acrem, graecis verbis, romanis moribus philosophantem. 64, 2 sq.: lectus est liber Quinti Sextii patris, magni . . viri et, licet neget, Stoici. quantus in illo . . vigor est, quantum animi! . . cum legeris Sextium dices: vivit, viget, liber est, supra hominem est, dimittit me plenum ingentis fiduciae. ib. 5: hoc quoque egregium Sextius habet quod et ostendet tibi beatae vitae magnitudinem et desperationem eius non faciet. 73, 12: solebat Sextius dicere Iovem plus non posse quam bonum virum. ib. 15: credamus itaque Sextio . . clamanti: hac itur ad astra. De ira III 36, 1: faciebat hoc Sextius ut consummato die . . interrogaret animum suum: quod hodie malum tuum sanasti? ib. II 36, 1. Epist. 108, 17 sq.: dicebat quare Pythagoras animalibus abstinuisset, quare postea Sextius. The latter looked upon animal food

as an incentive of cruelty, luxury, and as unwholesome. Plin. n. h. XVIII 68, 274: hoc (a prophecy of a bad harvest) postea Sextius e Romanis sapientiae adsectatoribus Athenis fecit eadem ratione.

6. Sextius himself appears to have been fond of giving his precepts in the shape of sentences; fragments of them are contained in *Σέξτου τοῦ Πυθαγορείου γνῶμαι* in Orelli's Opusc. sent. I p. 244 and in Mullach's fragment. philosoph. gr. (Paris 1860) p. 522. When the struggle between polytheism, Judaism and Christianity broke out, these sentences, owing to their monotheistic and ascetic tendency, were mixed up with it, probably (according to M. Ott) in the general factory of literary production of this kind (e. g. Pseudo-Phocylides, the Sibylline oracles) at Alexandria and then they were alloyed with other monotheistic additions. The whole received a completely Christian colouring by Rufinus in his translation. Comp. his preface to his son Apronianus: Sixtum in Latinum verti, quem Sixtum ipsum esse tradunt qui apud vos idem in urbe romana Sixtus vocatur, episcopi et martyris gloria decoratus. . . omne opus ita breve ut de manu eius numquam possit recedere, totus hic liber ibi pristini alicuius pretiosi obtinens anuli locum. . . nunc ergo interim habeatur in manibus pro anulo liber. . . addidi et electa quaedam religiosi parentis (i. e. Sextius) ad filium, sed breve totum, ut merito omne opusculum vel enchiridion, si graece, vel latine anulus appelletur. This translation by Rufinus (whom see) contains 427 sentences, printed e. g. in Orelli l. l. p. 245—268, and Mullach l. l. p. 523—531; they exist also (under the still more corrupt name of Xistus) in a Syriac version, which is still more enlarged and christianized. It would be interesting to trace the gradual transition of these sentences from a general human (or Stoic and Pythagorean) meaning to theological purposes. Jerome (adv. Iovin. I 30) quotes from Sextius in Sententiis in a very significant and delicate manner: adulter est in suam uxorem amator, Rufinus nr. 222 says, however, bluntly: . . omnis impudicus vel amator ardentior. Cf. Meinr. Ott, on the character and origin of the sentences of the philosopher Sextius, Rottweil 1861. 71 pp. 4. and: On the Syriac select sentences of Xistus, bishop of Rome, an enlarged version of Sextius, Rottweil 1862 sq. 48 and 37 pp. 4. Sänger, the sentences of Sextius, in Geiger's Journal for Jewish Studies V 1 (1867).

7. Like his work on practical philosophy, Sextius had also composed his work on natural history in Greek and at least part of it was entitled *περὶ ὕλης* = materia medica (Erotian. Sev. v. *λείριον*). Sextius Niger, qui graece de medicina scripsit, is quoted by Pliny in those books which treat of the medical use of plants, animals, and metals, and XXXII 3, 13 he is styled diligentissimus medicinae. Dioscorides made also considerable use of Sextius. O. Jahn, Transactions of the Saxon Society of Literature, 1850, p. 277—280.

8. The son (see n. 6) continued his father's work; cf. Sen. nat. quaest. VII 32, 2: Sextiorum nova et romani roboris secta inter initia

sua, cum magno impetu coepisset, extincta est. On L. Crassitius see above 258, 2; on Papirius Fabianus below note 10 sq. Subsequently scripsit non parum multa Cornelius Celsus, Sextios secutus (Quintil. X 1, 124). Sotion (Sen. Epist. 108, 17 sqq.) appears also to have belonged to the pupils of Sextius.

9. Quintil. II 14, 2: haec interpretatio non minus dura est quam illa Plauti essentia atque entia. Cf. III 6, 23: *οὐσίαν*, quam Plautus essentiam vocat. VIII 3, 33: multa ex graeco formata nova, ac plurima a Sergio Flavo, quorum dura quaedam admodum videntur, ut ens et essentia; quae cur tantopere aspernemur nihil video. But Sen. Ep. 58, 6 says on essentia: Ciceronem auctorem huius verbi habeo, puto locupletem. si recentiorem quaeris, Fabianum, disertum et elegantem, orationis etiam ad nostrum fastidium nitidae. Various arbitrary attempts at reconciling the discrepant passages in Quintilian with one another (with X I, 124: Plautus in Stoicis rerum cognitioni utilis) and with that in Seneca see in Höfig, de Papir. p. 2—17. Seneca gives less trouble, as he mentions only two authors of different periods who are said both to have used essentia. In Quintilian Plauti might be changed to Flavi, if it were admissible to emend three passages to suit one deviating statement. Yet VIII 3, 33 does not mean that Sergius Flavus was the first to form ens and essentia; these words are rather defended there and excepted from the dura of Sergius Flavus, being merely quoted as instances of multa ex graeco formata. Nor is it maintained in the other two passages that Plautus was the first writer who used these words. We are, therefore, obliged to distinguish three writers: the bold innovator in words, Sergius Flavus the Stoic Plautus, and the adherent of Sextius, Papirius Fabianus.

10. Papirius Fabianus, called philosophus by Sen. suas. 1, 9. controv. II 9, 25. 13, 18. VII praef. 4. Sen. Ep. 40, 12: Fabianus, vir egregius et vita et scientia et . . eloquentia quoque. de brev. vitae 10, 1: Fabianus, non ex his cathedrariis philosophis, sed ex veris et antiquis. He commenced with the study of rhetoric. Sen. controv. II praef. 1: Fabianus philosophus, qui adolescens admodum tantae opinionis in declamando quantae postea in disputando fuit. exercebatur apud Arellium Fuscum etc. ab hac (i. e. the oratio lasciva of Ar. F.) cito se Fabianus separavit et luxuriam quidem cum voluit abiecit, obscuritatem non potuit evadere; haec illum in philosophiam persecuta est. (2.) deerat illi (i. e. Fab.) oratorium robur . .; splendor vero . . orationi aderat. voltus dicentis lenis et pro tranquillitate morum (cf. Sen. Epist. 11, 4) remissus. (4.) cum aliquando Sextium audiret (cf. n. 8) nihilominus declamitabat. . . (5.) habuit et Blandum rhetorem (above 37, 1) praeceptorem. . . apud Blandum diutius quam apud Fuscum Arellium studuit, sed cum iam transfugisset (to philosophy). . . nec ille declamationibus vacabat et ego tanto minorem natu quam ipse eram (hence Fabianus would appear to have been born 715—720, cf. Sen. controv. II 12, 1) audiebam quotiens inciderat, non quotiens volueram. An extensive specimen of his declamations ib. II 9, 10—13; others ib. 12

3. 10 sq. 13, 6 sq. 14, 4. Hence in all probability his habit of giving public lectures (on philosophy), cf. Sen. Epist. 52, 11: disserebat populo Fabianus, sed audiebatur modeste. erumpebat interdum magnus clamor laudantium, sed quem rerum magnitudo (cf. Epist. 100, 10) evocaverat. Among his pupils were Albucius Silus (see below 263, 4) and Seneca the philosopher (Epist. 100, 3. 12).

11. On the diction of Fabianus see Sen. Epist. 58, 6 (n. 9) and especially Epist. 100, where he says 1: Fabiani Papirii libros qui inscribuntur (artium) civilium legisse te scribis et non respondisse expectationi tuae; deinde oblitus de philosopho agi compositionem eius accusas; upon which Seneca elaborately defends and characterizes Fabianus and states (9) that in his philosophical works (with regard to style) only Cicero (cuius libri ad philosophiam pertinentes paene totidem sunt quot Fabiani, 9), Asinius Pollio and Livy surpassed him. He differed from Cicero in writing chiefly on subjects of natural history; Fabianus causarum naturalium II in Charis. p. 106, 14 sqq. K.; less accurately causarum libro II et III ib. p. 146, 28; causarum tertio in Diomed. I p. 375, 22 K. See also Val. Prob. p. 209, 21 and Serg. expl. p. 542, 16 K. (gramm. lat. IV). Fabianus de animalibus primo in Charis. p. 105, 14 sq. cf. p. 142, 14. Cf. Plin. n. h. IX 8, 25. He seems to have treated both of zoology and botany (pharmacology), according to the quotations in Pliny n. h. XII 8. XV 2. XVIII 28, 277 (a Fabiano graecisque auctoribus). XXIII 30. XXVIII 14 (Aristoteles et Fabianus). But he appears to have been somewhat uncritical, to conclude from the statement ib. XXXVI 24: inter plurima alia Italiae miracula ipsa marmora in lapicidinis crescere auctor est Papirius Fabianus, naturae rerum peritissimus. Cf. also ib. II 46. 105. Herm. Gust. Höfig, de Papirii Fabiani philosophi vita scriptisque, Breslau (1852) 59 pp.

262. Eloquence, so far as it still dated from the republican time, was in the Augustan age represented by Asinius Pollio and M. Messala, besides whom we may mention Furnius, Atratinus, L. Arruntius, Q. Haterius (a. 690—779), and others. The younger generation suited their talents to the narrow circle still allowed by the monarchy; e. g. the sons of Messala, Messalinus and Cotta, Fabius Maximus, and others. Greater importance attaches to T. Labienus and Cassius Severus, whose candour of expression brought them into trouble, Labienus becoming obnoxious through his historical work. Cassius Severus, a writer hated and feared on account of his poignant humour, may still be considered an orator and engaged in scholastic declamation though against his free will; yet in the manner of his eloquence he betrayed his affinity to the prevailing style of the period.

1. On Asinius Pollio and Messala as Orators see above 218, 4 and 9. On Furnius above 206, 9; Sempronius Atratinus 206, 10. On the rhetorical training and the eloquence of Augustus see 217, 2; of Maecenas 217, 7; of Agrippa 217, 11.

2. Torquatus who pleaded Moschi (below 263, 12) causam (Hor. Ep. I 5, 9, perhaps a. 735), and in whom Hor. O. IV 7, 23 sq. praises genus, facundia, and pietas, as the narration of Suetonius leads us to infer that the Manlii Torquati had become extinct in the Civil Wars, is probably (see Weichert de Cass. Parm. p. 304—314) the person mentioned by Suet. Aug. 43: in hoc (Troiae) ludicro Nonium Asprenatem lapsu debilitatum aureo torque donavit passusque est ipsum posterosque Torquati ferre cognomen. Cf. ib. 56: cum Asprenas Nonius artius ei (i. e. Augustus) iunctus causam veneficii accusante Cassio Severo diceret etc. He may, therefore, be one of the two Asprenates whose declamations are mentioned by the rhetorician Seneca, frequently on Publius, e. g. suas. 7, 4. contr. I 1, 5. 2, 9 sq. 8, 4—6 and 12 sq. II 10, 4. VII 23, 6. X 33, 35 (P. Asprenates dixit), once also on Lucius, ib. X praef. 2 (pertinere non ad rem puto quomodo . . L. Asprenates aut Quintilianus senex declamaverit; transeo istos quorum fama cum ipsis extincta est). L. Nonius Asprenas was Cons. 759 v. c., another a. 782 = 29 A. D.; a P. Nonius Asprenas (son of the declaimer?) Cons. 791 = 38 in the reign of Caligula.

3. On L. Arruntius (n. 8) see above 254, 7.

4. Q. Lucretius Vespillo, Cons. 735: see W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. IV p. 1198, nr. 23. A funeral speech on his wife Julia who died after a married life of 41 years, about 746—752, the fervid outpouring of feeling, is preserved in an inscription, Orelli 4859. Th. Mommsen, Trans. of the Academy at Berlin 1863, p. 455 sqq. 477 sqq.

5. Hieronym. on Euseb. chr. a. Abr. 2040 = Tib. 11 = 777 v. c.: Q. Haterius promptus et popularis orator usque ad XC prope annum cum summo honore consenescit. Tac. A. IV 61: fine anni (779 = 26 A. D.) excessere insignes viri, Asinius Agrippa . . et Q. Haterius, familia senatoria, eloquentiae quoad vixit celebratae. monimenta ingeni eius haud perinde retinentur. scilicet impetu magis quam cura vigebat. . . Haterii canorum illud et profluens cum ipso simul extinctum est. Seneca Exc. controv. IV praef. 6—11 (p. 376—378 Bu.): Q. Haterium scio . . imbecillo animo mortes sex filiorum tulisse. . . declamabat Haterius admisso populo ex tempore. solus omnium Romanorum quos modo ipse cognovi in latinam linguam transtulerat graecam facultatem. tanta erat illi velocitas orationis ut vitium fieret. . . nec verborum illi tantum copia sed etiam rerum erat. . . quaedam antiqua et a Cicerone dicta, a ceteris deinde deserta dicebat. . . multa erant quae reprehenderes, multa quae suspiceres etc. Sen. Epist. 40, 10. Specimens of his declamations are frequently given by Seneca the Elder; see p. 15. 27, 14 sqq. 39, 4 sqq. 97. 185. 193. 198. 236. 272. 284. 285. 286. 287. 334 Bu. Cf. also Tac. A. II 33 (consularis). Suet. Tib. 27. 29.

6. M. Valerius Messala or Messalinus, the orator's eldest son, Cons. 751; see A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. VI 1 p. 2355 sq. nr. 100. Tac. A. III 34: Valerius Messalinus, cui parens Messala ineratqe imago paternae facundiae. See above 225, 2, n. 1 and 240, 4. His appointment as XVvir sacr. in celebrated in Tibull. II 5 (of a. 735? Lachmann 729 or 730). Letters addressed to him by Ovid Trist. IV 4 (v. 5: cuius in ingenio patriae facundia linguaest) and ex Ponto I 7. II 2. His younger brother was called M. Aurelius Cotta Maximus, after he had been adopted into the family of his mother, the gens Aurelia, but after his brother's death (he may have died childless) he assumed his cognomen of Messalinus. He took little part in political life and shifted his position with the utmost servility; in all other respects he led the life of an Epicurean (egens ob luxum, per flagitia infamis, Tac. A. VI 7) which, besides culinary enjoyment (Plin. n. h. X 22) included also poetical attempts (above 247, 16) and witticisms (Tac. A. VI 5). He was on friendly terms with Ovid; see ex Ponto I 5. II 3. 8. III 2. 5, probably also Trist. IV 5. Ovid read at Tomi a speech which he had made before the tribunal of the Centumvirs, Pont. III 5, 7 sqq. (legimus, o iuvenis patrii non degener oris, dicta tibi pleno verba diserta foro). See on him A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. VI 2. p. 2356, nr. 100. W. Henzen, Annali dell' inst. archeol. XXXVII p. 5—17.

7. Paulus Fabius Maximus, Cons. 743 v. c. Ovid addressed to him ex Ponto I 2. 9. III 3. 8. On him ib. IV 6, 9 (Fabiae laus, Maximae gentis). I 2, 69 (romanae facundia, Maxime, linguae), 119 (doctae dulcedine linguae) and 137 (tua nonnumquam . . scripta legebas): Horace O. IV 1, 9 sqq. (centum puer artium). Quintil. VI 3, 52. It is however, doubtful, whether he is identical with Fabianus Maximus, nobilissimus vir, is qui primus foro romano hunc novitium morbum quo nunc laborat intulit (Sen. controv. II 12, 11. p. 154, 14 sqq. Bu.). A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. VI 2. p. 2919 sq. nr. 67.

8. Tac. A. XI 6 (in the time of Claudius, A. D. 47): meminissent Gai Asinii, M. Messalae ac recentiorum Arruntii (n. 3) et Aesernini: ad summa provectos incorrupta vita et facundia. Aeserninus is probably the son of the Consul of 732, M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus, and grandson to Asinius Pollio (Suet. Aug. 43), born perhaps 725—730, initiated into eloquence by his grandfather; see Sen. exc. controv. IV praef. 3 sq. (p. 376 Bu.) where we read e. g.: Marcellus, quamvis puer, iam tantae indolis erat ut Pollio ad illum pertinere successionem eloquentiae suae crederet. Specimens (though generally short ones) of his declamations are given by Sen. suas. p. 13. 28. 30. controv. p. 160. 185. 192. 200, 23—30. p. 208 Bu. Cf. also Tac. A. III 11, and above 254, 7.

9. Plinius n. h. XXXIV 18, 47: duo pocula . . quae Cassio Salano . . praeceptori suo Germanicus Caesar . . donaverat. This is the Salaminus to whom Ovid addressed ex Ponto II 5, in which he is called doctissimus (v. 15), and his eloquium (40) and facundia (69) are praised,

and also poetical compositions by him are indicated (63—68), also his relations to Germanicus (41—56) being mentioned.

10. On T. Labienus see especially Seneca the Elder Contr. X. praef. 4 sqq. p. 292—294 Bu., e. g.: declamavit non quidem populo, sed egregie. . . magnus orator, qui multa impedimenta eluctatus ad famam ingeni confitentibus magis hominibus pervenerat quam volentibus. summa egestas erat, summa infamia, summum odium. . . color orationis antiquae, vigor novae, cultus inter nostrum ac prius saeculum medius. libertas tanta ut libertatis nomen excederet et, quia passim ordines hominesque laniabat, rabies vocaretur. . . in hoc primum excogitata est nova poena: effectum est enim per inimicos eius ut omnes eius libri (ex senatus consulto) comburerentur. . . non tulit hanc Labienus contumeliam nec superstes esse ingenio suo voluit, sed in monumenta se maiorum suorum ferri iussit atque ita includi (c. 765 v. c.?). . . memini aliquando, cum recitaret historiam, magnam partem illum libri convolvisse et dixisse: haec quae transeo post mortem meam legentur. Suet. Calig. 16: Titi Labieni, Cordi Cremuti, Cassi Severi scripta, senatus consultis abolita, requiri et esse in manibus lectitarique permisit. Sen. controv. p. 375, 17: homo mentis quam linguae amarioris. Specimens of his declamations are found ib. p. 310, 21. 312, 21. 315, 8. 322, 22 sqq. 325, 4 sqq. In the law-suit about the inheritance of Urbinia, Labienus was the sollicitor of Figulus and opposed to Asinius Pollio; cf. Quintil. I 5, 8. IV 1, 11. IX 3, 13. Charis. p. 77, 14. 376, 8 K. A speech of Lab. against Bathyllus is indicated by Sen. contr. X praef. 8 (p. 294, 3 Bu.). Cf. Weichert de L. Vario p. 319—324.

11. Tac. A. I 72: primus Augustus cognitionem de famosis libellis . . tractavit, commotus Cassii Severi libidine, qua viros feminasque inlustres procacibus scriptis diffamaverat. The noble writer's indignation at this presumption appears also ib. IV 21: relatum de Cassio Severo exule, qui sordidae originis, maleficae vitae, sed orandi validus, per immodicas ut . . Cretam amoveretur effecerat; atque illic eadem actitando recentia veteraque odia advertit, bonisque exutus . . saxo Seripho consenuit. Hieronym. ad a. Abr. 2048 = Tib. 19 = 785 v. c.: Cassius Severus, orator egregius, qui Quintianum illud proverbium luserat, XXV exilii sui anno in summa inopia moritur vix panno verenda contectus. He may, therefore, have been born c. 710 v. c., and for this very reason, even if there were no others, Hor. Epo. 6 cannot relate to him; see W. Teuffel Ztsch. f. AW. 1845, p. 596—598. His character is delineated by Sen. Exc. controv. III praef. (p. 359 sqq. Bu.): oratio eius erat valens cultu, ingentibus plena sententiis. . . non est quod illum ex his quae edidit aestimetis; . . eloquentia eius longe maior erat quam lectio. . . corporis magnitudo conspicua (cf. Plin. n. h. VII 10: Cassio Severo celebri oratori armentarii mirmillonis obiecta, similitudo est), suavitas valentissimae vocis. . . gravitas, quae deerat vitae, actioni supererat. . . uno die privatas plures agebat, . . publicam vero numquam amplius quam unam uno die. nec tamen scio quem

reum illi defendere nisi se (against the accusation of Fabianus Maximus, ib. p. 154, 16) contigerit: . . omnia habebat quae illum ut bene declamaret instruerent: phrasin . . lectam, genus dicendi . . ardens et concitatum, . . explicationes plus sensuum quam verborum habentes. . . tamen non tantum infra se, cum declamaret, sed infra multos erat. Itaque raro declamabat et non nisi ab amicis coactus. He himself explains this ib. 12 by saying that he could only causas agere, in foro dicere, but not pursue this idle occupation seriously. Cf. suasor. 6, 11. Specimens of his witticisms ib. controv. II 12, 11. IV praef. 11. IX 26, 14. X praef. 8. 34, 20. Quintil. VI 3, 27 cf. 78 sq. 1, 43. VIII 2, 2. 3, 89. XI 3, 133. Suet. gramm. 22. Specimens of his declamations are given by Sen. controv. VII 18, 10. IX 25, 12 and especially X 33, 2 (p. 316 sq.). The exaggeration of details in the latter proves the judgment of Tac. dial. 19: antiquorum admiratores . . Cassium Severum . . primum affirmant flexisse ab ista vetere atque directa dicendi via, and ib. 26: equidem non negaverim Cassium Severum, . . si iis comparetur qui postea fuerunt, posse oratorem vocari, quamquam in magna parte librorum suorum plus viri habet quam sanguinis; primus enim contempto ordine rerum, omissa modestia ac pudore verborum . . non pugnat, sed rixatur. ceterum . . et varietate eruditionis et lepore urbanitatis et ipsarum virium robore multum ceteros superat. Quintil. X 1, 116: multa, si cum iudicio legatur, dabit imitatione digna Cassius Severus, qui, si ceteris virtutibus colorem et gravitatem orationis adiecisset, ponendus inter praecipuos foret. (117.) nam et ingenii plurimum est in eo et acerbitas mira et urbanitas eius summa; sed plus stomacho quam consilio dedit. According to Dio LV 4, he accused (a. 745) Augustus' friend, Nonius Asprenas, (see n. 2) of poisoning, Asinius Pollio being the defendant's sollicitor; see also Quintil. X 1, 22. One of his speeches is quoted by Diomed I p. 371, 19 K.; Cassius Severus ad Maecenatem (a letter?) in Charis. I p. 104, 11 K. = Priscian. VII 55. p. 333, 11 H.; Cassius ad Tiberium secundo ap. Diomed. I p. 373, 20 = Priscian. IX 53. p. 489, 3 H. Cf. also Hertz on Priscian VIII 15. p. 380, 1. The assumption that he was a native of Longula has lost its foundation since the punctuation has been changed in the ind. auct. in Pliny n. h. XXXV, in the following manner: ex . . Cassio Severo, Longulano. This Longulanus, however, is completely unknown to us, just as well as Fabius Vestalis qui de pictura scripsit, who is mentioned directly afterwards and also quoted in the list of authors on b. VII and XXXVI.

12. Varius Geminus, sublimis orator (L. Seneca ap. Hieronym. adv. Iovin. I), apud Caesarem dixit: Caesar, qui apud te audent dicere magnitudinem tuam ignorant, qui non audent, humanitatem (Sen. exc. contr. VI 8, 6). Specimens of his declamations are given by Sen. suas. 6, 11—14. contr. VII 16, 18 sq. and 23. 19, 5. 21, 10 and 15—17. 22, 11.

262. Among the rhetoricians of the Augustan age the most eminent of the older generation are M. Porcius Latro,

the compatriot and early friend of Seneca the Elder; Arellius Fuscus, who followed the prevailing taste of Asia, his native country; C. Albucius Silus of Novara, Passienus the Elder; the vain Cestius Pius of Smyrna; L. Iunius Gallio, also a friend of the elder Seneca's. In the younger generation we may mention among the, relatively speaking, most eminent rhetoricians Papirius Fabianus, a man of philosophical training, and Alfius Flavus, who wrote also in verse. With a great number of other school-rhetoricians we meet in the pages of Seneca the Elder.

1. Sen. controv. X praef. 13: primum tetradeum quod faciam quaeritis? Latronis, Fusci, Albuci, Gallionis. As a proof of the prevalent bad taste he mentions ib. III praef. 14: et Pollionem Asinium et Messalam Corvinum et Passienum . . minus bene videri quam Cestium aut Latronem. In general see Andr. Schott, de claris apud Senecam rhetoribus, in the Paris editions of Seneca, 1607 and 1613.

2. Hieronym. chron. a. Abr. 2013 = Aug. 40 = 751 v. c.: M. Porcius Latro (cf. Suet. ind. rhet. p. 99 Rffsch.) latinus declamator taedio duplicis quartanae semet ipsum interficit. His character is delineated by Sen. controv. I praef. 13—18. 20—24, e. g.: Latronis Porcii, carissimi mihi sodalis, memoriam . . et a prima pueritia usque ad ultimum eius diem perductam familiarem amicitiam. . . nihil illo viro gravius, nihil suavius, . . nemo plus ingenio suo imperavit, nemo plus indulsit. in utraque parte vehementi viro modus deerat. . . (16.) corpus illi erat natura solidum et multa exercitatione duratum. . . vox robusta, sed sordida lucubrationibus et neglegentia . . infuscata. . . nulla umquam illi cura vocis exercendae fuit: illum fortem et agrestem et hispanae consuetudinis morem non poterat dediscere. (17.) . . memoria et natura quidem felix, plurimum tamen arte adiuta. (20.) . . cum in illo, si qua alia virtus fuit, et subtilitas fuerit. . . (22.) cum condiscipuli essemus (at Rome) apud Marillum rhetorem, hominem satis aridum. . . (24.) controversia . . quam primam Latronem meum declamasse memini admodum iuvenem in Marilli schola. IX praef. 3.: Latronem Porcium, declamatoriae virtutis unicum exemplum, cum pro reo in Hispania Rustico Porcio propinquo suo diceret etc. — Quintil. X 5, 18 (P. L., qui primus clari nominis professor fuit). X praef. 15: Latro numquam solebat disputare in convivio aut alio quam quo declamare poterat tempore. . . negabat itaque ulli se placere posse nisi totum nossent se et suas vires. Numerous specimens of his declamations are given by Seneca the Elder (e. g. contr. VII 16, 16 sqq.) which show him to have been a relatively natural and moderate rhetorician. Cf. Lindner p. 25—44. Messala thought his style not purely Roman (Sen. controv. II 12, 8). From a declamatio de raptore (Sen. contr. II 11) by Latro a passage is quoted by Quintil. IX 2, 91. His pupils were greatly attached to him; see Sen. controv. IX praef. 23: nec ulli alii

contigisse scio quam apud Graecos Niceti, apud Romanos Latroni ut discipuli non audiri desiderarent, sed contenti essent audire. They would even drink cuminum silvestre to look pale like their master (Plin. n. h. XX 160). Among these pupils were Ovid (242, 1), Florus (Sen. controv. IX praef. 23 sq.), Fulvius Sparsus and Arbronius Silo (Sen. suas. 2, 19). G. Lindner, de M. Porcio Latrone commentatio, Breslau 1855. 52 pp. Diss.

3. Sen. controv. IX 29, 16: Fuscus Arellius cum esset ex Asia etc. was closely allied to his compatriots Addaeus (ib. IX 24, 12 sq.) and Hybreas (ib. IX 29, 16). Suas. 4, 5: quia soletis mihi molesti esse de Fusco, quid fuerit, quare nemo videretur dixisse cultius, ingeram vobis Fuscinas explicationes. dicebat autem suasorias libentissime, et frequentius graecas quam latinas. His manner is repeatedly characterized by Seneca the Elder; e. g. suas. 2, 10: ut sciretis quam nitide Fuscus dixisset vel quam licenter. . . nihil fuisse me iuvene (which shows that Fuscus was somewhat older than Seneca) tam notum quam has explicationes Fusci etc. Cf. ib. 3, 7: descriptionibus Fusci vos satiem? Controv. II praef. 1: erat explicatio Fusci Arelli splendida quidem sed operosa et implicata, cultus nimis adquisitus, compositio verborum mollior . .; summa inaequalitas orationis, quae modo exilis erat, modo nimia licentia vaga et effusa; principia, argumenta, narrationes aride dicebantur; in descriptionibus extra legem omnibus verbis, dummodo niterent, permissa libertas; nihil acre, nihil solidum, nihil horridum; splendida oratio et magis lasciva quam laeta. To this should be added suas. 3, 5: solebat Fuscus ex Vergilio multa trahere, ut Maecenati imputaret; cf. ib. 4, 5. Seneca the Elder's work contains numerous specimens of the eloquence of Fuscus, the longest of which stand suasor. 2, 1 sqq. controv. II 9, 4—8. VII 21, 7 sq. Cf. Lindner p. 11—23, where p. 22: sanam sectabatur eloquentiam. sanos perumque habet colores, sanas sententias, splendidam descriptionem et copiosam, quamvis interdum nimis cultam et luxuriosam; figuras plurimas quidem nec vero inepte cumulatas. oratio argenteae est aetatis. . . divisio denique . . apud Fuscum arida deprehenditur. As Seneca in some of these passages calls him Arellius Fuscus (or Fuscus Arellius) pater, we infer that, like Clodius Turrinus (Sen. controv. X praef. 14 sqq.) he had, at the time when Seneca wrote his work, a son who in his turn pursued rhetorical studies, though it does not entitle us to explain those passages, in which pater is omitted and we read only Arellius Fuscus or Fuscus Arellius, of the son, the designation of filius being never added. On the contrary it appears from the numerous instances in which in one and the same sentence pater is now added and then again omitted, that all the passages of Seneca should be understood of the father, he being the famous rhetorician of the name. See W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. I 2, p. 1496, nr. 6. Lindner p. 4—6. Among his pupils were Ovid (242, 1) and Papirius Fabianus (261, 10 sq.). Certainly not of him, but perhaps of his son, Pliny says n. h. XXXIII 54: vidimus et ipsi Arellium Fuscum (motum equestri ordine ob insignem

calumniam, cum celebritate assectarentur adolescentium scholae) ex argento anulos habentem. F. G. Lindner, de Arellio Fusco commentatio, Breslau 1862. 4.

6. Suet. rhet. 6 (= gramm. 30): C. Albucius Silus Novariensis cum aedilitate in patria fungeretur . . contendit . . inde Romam, receptusque in Planci oratoris (above 206, 8) contubernium . . ex eo clarus propria auditoria instituit, solitus declamare genere vario: modo splendide atque adornate, tum . . circumcise ac sordide et tantum non trivialibus verbis. egit et causas, verum rarius, dum amplissimam quamque sectatur nec alium in ulla locum quam perorandi. postea renuntiavit foro, partim pudore partim metu (especially after in a suit pleaded before the Centumviri L. Arruntius had made him feel the difference between rhetorical figures and legal deductions, Sen. controv. VII praef. 7. Suet. l. l. Quintil. IX 2, 95). et rursus in cognitione caedis Mediolani apud L. Pisonem proconsulem (Cons. 739 v. c.) defendens reum . . paene poenas luit. iam autem senior ob vitium vomicae Novariam rediit convocataque plebe causis propter quas mori destinasset diu ac more contionantis redditis abstinuit cibo. Hieronym. ad a. Abr. 2011 = Aug. 38 = 749 v. c.: Albucius Silo Novariensis clarus rhetor agnoscitur. Everything proves him to have been a contemporary of Seneca the Elder (Lindner p. 7 sq.). Quintil. II 15, 36: Albucius, non obscurus professor atque auctor, a passage which also shows that he wrote on the theory of eloquence. Cf. ib. III 3, 4. 6, 62. Ps. Vergil. Catal. 7, 3 sq.: vos, Sile Albuci Arquitique Varroque, scholasticorum natio madens pingui. His oratorical style is described by Sen. controv. VII praef., e. g.: (1.) instatis mihi quotidie de Albucio. non ultra vos differam, quamvis non audierim frequenter, cum per totum annum quinquiens sexiensve populo diceret (declaimed publicly) . . alius erat cum turbae se committebat, alius cum paucitate contentus erat. . . illa intempestiva in declamationibus eius philosophia sine modo tunc . . evagabatur. cum populo diceret omnes vires suas advocabat et ideo non desinebat. . . argumentabatur moleste magis quam subtiliter. . . (2.) . . splendor orationis quantus nescio an in nullo alio fuerit. . . dicebat citato et effuso cursu, sed praeparatus. . . sententiae . . simplices, apertae. . . (3.) . . non posses de inopia sermonis latini queri cum illum audires: tantum orationis cultae fluebat. . . (4.) timebat ne scholasticus videretur. . . quem proxime dicentem commode audierat imitari volebat. memini illum . . apud Fabianum philosophum tanto iuveniorem quam ipse erat cum codicibus sedere; (5.) memini admiratione Hermagorae stupentem ad imitationem eius ardescere. nulla fiducia ingenii sui et ideo adsidua mutatio. . . (6.) raro Albucio respondebat fortuna, semper opinio. . . (7.) erat homo summae probitatis, qui nec facere iniuriam nec pati sciret. See also ib. I 4, 14 (Albucius, qui Graecos praeminet). Numerous specimens of his declamations are given by Seneca the Elder, e. g. controv. VII 16, 1—3. IX 25, 6—8. F. G. Lindner, de Gaio Albucio Silo commentatio, Breslau 1861. 18 pp. 4.

5. Hieronym. ad a. Abr. 2008 = Aug. 35 = 746 v. c.: Passienus pater, declamator insignis, diem obit. Seneca controv. II 13, 17: Passienus, vir eloquentissimus et temporis sui primus orator. Exc. contr. III praef. 14: Passienum, qui nunc primo loco stat. X praef. 11: Passieno . . declamatori subtili, sed arido. III praef. 10: Passienus noster (Cassius Severus being the speaker) cum coepit dicere, secundum principium statim fuga fit, ad epilogum omnes revertimur, media tantum quibus necesse est audiunt. He was esteemed by Augustus (tantus vir), ib. X 34, 21. See also ib. VII 16, 20. His son was Passienus Crispus bis consul (iterum A. D. 44), orator, Agrippinae matrimonio et Nerone privigno clarior postea (Plin. n. h. XVI 242). Cf. Schol. Iuv. IV 81 (though there he appears to be confounded with Vibius Crispus, below 291, 2): plurimas sponte causas apud centumviros egit. . . consulatus duos gessit. uxores habuit duas, primam Domitiam, deinde Agrippinam. . . omnium principum gratiam adpetivit, sed praecipue C. Caesaris. . . periit per fraudem Agrippinae etc. Tac. A. VI 20 (scitum Passieni oratoris dictum). Quintil. VI 1, 50. X 1, 24 (nobis pueris insignes pro Voluseno Catulo Domitii Afri, Crispi Passieni, D. Laelii orationes ferebantur). The philosopher Seneca addressed to him from his exile the 6th epigram (in Riese, Anth. lat. 405, p. 264, e. g. v. 2: Crispe, vel antiquo conspiciende foro. v. 8 sq.: cuius cecropio pectora melle madent, maxima facundo vel avo vel gloria patri). Cf. ib. 445 (p. 281).

6. L. Cestius Pius (Suet. ind. rhett., p. 99 Rffsch.) Smyrnaeus rhetor latine Romae docuit, Hieronym. ad a. Abr. 2004 = Aug. 31 = 742 v. c. Sen. suas. 7, 13: erat Cestius nullius quidem ingenii, Ciceroni etiam infestus, quod illi non inpune cessit. nam cum M. Tullius filius Ciceronis Asiam optineret (a. 725) . . servus . . interroganti domino quis ille vocaretur qui in imo recumberet ait: hic est Cestius qui patrem tuum negabat litteras scisse; adferri protinus flagra iussit et Ciceroni . . de corio Cestii satisfecit. Exc. controv. III praef. 15: pueri fere aut iuvenes scholas frequentant; hi non tantum disertissimis viris (contemporaries) Cestium suum praeferunt sed etiam Ciceroni praeferrent ni lapides timerent. . . huius declamationes ediscunt, illius orationes non legunt nisi eas quibus Cestius rescripsit. (16.) memini (says Cassius Severus) me intrare scholam eius cum recitaturus esset in Milonem Cestius (cf. Quintil. X 5, 20: rescribere veteribus orationibus, ut fecit Cestius contra Ciceronis actionem habitam pro Milone). . . Cestius Ciceroni responsurus mihi quod responderet non invenit. . . (17.) deinde libuit (mihi) Ciceroni de Cestio in foro satisfacere. . . dixi molestum me amplius non futurum si iurasset disertiorem esse Ciceronem quam se. nec hoc ut faceret vel ioco vel serio effici potuit. Contr. VII praef. 8: Cestii, mordacissimi hominis. 16, 27: Cestium latinorum verborum inopia hominem graecum laborasse, sensibus abundasse. Many specimens of his declamations occur in the pages of Seneca. Of his pupils we may mention Surdinus (15, 3), Aietius Pastor (Sen. contr. I 3, 11), Quintilius Varus (the son of the well-known general

and son-in-law to Germanicus. ib. I 3, 10), and especially Argentarius, see Sen. contr. IX 26, 12 (p. 265 Bu.). Cestius . . quid putatis, aiebat, Argentarium esse? Cesti simius est. . . fuerat enim Argentarius Cesti auditor et erat imitator. aiebat invicem: quid putatis esse Cestium nisi Cesti cinerem? (13.) omnibus autem insistebat (Arg.) Cesti vestigiis: aeque ex tempore dicebat, aeque contumeliose multa interponebat; illud tamen optima fide praestitit, cum uterque Graecus esset, ut numquam graece declamaret. Cf. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. I 2. p. 1518, nr. 1. F. G. Lindner, de L. Cestio Pio, Züllichau 1858. 17 pp. 4.

7. (L.) Iunius Gallio, friend to Seneca the Elder (Gallio noster, Sen. p. 21, 15. 130, 2. 160, 11. 162, 2. 181, 10. 359, 15 Bu.), and Ovid (Nasoni suo, ib. p. 21, 30) probably the same Gallio whom Ovid endeavours to console on the death of his wife, ex Ponto IV 11. He seems to have been rather of the same age as Ovid than Seneca the Elder; see Sen. controv. VII praef. 5 sq. He wrote a rhetorical work (Quintil. III 1, 21: pater Gallio) and declamations (ib. IX 2, 91: remissius et pro suo ingenio pater Gallio; cf. Tac. dial. 26: tinnitus Gallionis), which were still extant in the age of Hieronymus, (comm. in Esaiam, praef.: qui . . concinnas declamationes desiderant legant Tullium, Quintilianum, Gallionem, Gabinianum). Specimens which lead us to infer relative sobriety of style (see B. Schmidt p. 22—24) are frequent in Seneca, the longer ones occur suas. 5, 8. controv. I 1, 4 and 14. 2, 11 sq. 7, 12. 8, 9. II 11, 6 sq. and 4. VII 16, 12 sq. 22, 3—5. 23, 4. 24, 8 and 10. IX 26, 2 sq. and 6. 27, 12 sq. 28, 1. 7 sq. 11. 21. X 31, 1—3. 34, 13—17. See also X praef. 8: monstrabo bellum vobis libellum, quem a Gallione vestro petatis. recitavit rescriptum Labieno pro Bathyllo Maecenatis. Tac. A. VI 3. Dio LX 35. LXII 25. B. Schmidt, de L. Iunio Gallione rhetore, Marburg 1866. 33 pp. 8. He adopted the eldest son of his friend Seneca, M. Annaeus Novatus, who was subsequently called L. Iunius Gallio (Dio LX 35), and obtained a consulship under Claudius and then governed Achaia (A. D. 52.). Stat. Silv. II 7, 32 calls him dulcis. His brother Seneca addressed to him (under the name of Novatus) his treatises de ira and (ad Gallionem) de vita beata. According to Tac. A. XV 73, he survived Seneca (+ 65), but was soon forced to follow his example; see Hieron. a. Abr. 2080 = Nor. 10 = 64 v. c. instead of 65): Iunius Gallio, frater Senecae, egregius declamator (perhaps a confusion with his adoptive father) propria se manu interficit. W. Teuffel in Pauly's Encycl. I 1. p. 1015, nr. 13a.

8. Iunius Otho pater . . edidit quattuor libros colorum, quos bello Gallio noster Antiphontis libros vocabat: tantum in illis somniorum est, Sen. controv. II 9, 33. Cf. I 3, 11: Othonem Iunium patrem memini colorem stultum inducere, quod minus ferendum est quod libros colorum edidit. Seneca gives also specimens of his declamations. He was praetor a. 775 = 22. Of him Tac. A. III 66: Iunio Othoni litterarium ludum exercere vetus ars fuit; mox Seiani potentia senator obscura initia impudentibus ausis propolluebat.

9. Sen. controv. I 1, 22: hanc partem memini apud Cestium declamari ab Alfio Flavo, ad quem audiendum me fama perduxerat; qui cum praetextatus esset tantae opinionis fuit ut populo rom. puer eloquentia notus esset. . . tanto concursu hominum audiebatur ut raro auderet post illum Cestius dicere. ipse omnia mala faciebat ingenio suo. naturalis tamen illa vis eminebat quae post multos annos, iam et desidia obruta et carminibus (which probably means erotic poems) enervata, vigorem tamen suum tenuit. Cf. II 14, 8: Flavum Alfium, auditorem suum, qui eandem rem lascivius dixerat, obiurgavit (Cestius). Exc. contr. III 7, 3: Alfius Flavus hanc sententiam dixit: . . hunc Cestius quasi corrupte dixisset obiurgans, apparet, inquit, te poetas studiose legere: iste sensus eius est qui hoc saeculum amatoriis non artibus tantum sed sententiis implevit (of Ovid). Specimens of the declamations of Alfius are given by Sen. controv. I 1, 23. 7, 7. II 10, 3. He is probably the same as Alfius Flavus whom Pliny n. h. IX 8, 25 (ni res Maecenatis et Fabiani et Flavi Alfii multorumque esset litteris mandata), comp. ind. auct. l. IX, quotes as his authority for an anecdote of the age of Augustus.

10. Among the other rhetoricians from whom Seneca the Elder quotes extracts and who partly belong to the period of Tiberius, those who are most frequently mentioned are Argentarius (above n. 6), P. (Nonius) Asprenas (above 262, 2), Blandus (above 261, 10), Bruttedius Brutus, (Fabius?) Buteo, Capito (Sen. contr. X praef. 12), Clodius Sabinus and Turrinus (X praef. 14 sqq.), Cornelius Hispanus, Fulvius Sparsus (an imitator of Latro, Sen. contr. X praef. 11; homo inter scholasticos sanus, inter sanos scholasticus, ib. I 7, 15), Gavius Sabinus and Silo (X praef. 14), Iulius Bassus (see above 249, 4), Licinius Nepos, Marillus (praeceptor noster, Sen. contr. VII 17, 11; above n. 2), Murredius (very slightingly treated by Seneca, see Körber p. 64 sq.), Musa (X praef. 9), Oscus (ib. 10 sq.), Pompeius Silo (sedens et facundus et litteratus est et haberetur disertus si a praelocutione dimitteret; declamat male, ib. III praef. 11; homo qui iudicio censebatur, ib. IX 25, 22; a contemporary of Porcius Latro, see ib. VII 23, 10. IX 28, 10. Extensive specimens are given suas. 7, 5 and 10 sq. contr. I 2, 20. 5, 3. 7, 13. II 9, 16 and 20 sq. IX 25, 17 sq. 29, 14 sq. X 32, 11); the delator Romanius Hispo (erat natura qui asperiorem dicendi viam sequeretur, ib. IX 26, 11 cf. VII 17, 13. Tac. A. I 74. XIV 65. Quintil. VI 3, 100), Sepullius Bassus, Triarius (compositione verborum belle cadentium multos scholasticos delectabat, Sen. contr. VII 19, 10; a contemporary of Asinius Pollio, Latro and Cestius, ib. II 11, 19. VII 19, 10. IX 29, 11; long specimens suas. 7, 6. contr. I 2, 21. II 12, 8. VII 20, 1 sq. IX 25, 20 sq. 29, 9 and 11. X 33, 4. 34, 5); Vallius Syriacus, Vibius Gallus (fuit tam magnae olim eloquentiae quam postea insaniae, a contemporary of Papirius Fabianus Sen. contr. II 9, 25 sq.; specimens ib. II 9, 9. VII 20, 3. 23, 5. IX 24, 4. 29, 2) and Vibius Rufus (erat qui antiquo genere diceret, ib. IX 25, 25. specimens ib. II 9, 2. 11, 8. 14, 10. VII 18, 4; but the one quoted by Pliny in his ind

auct. on b. XIV, XV, XIX, XXI, is called Vib. Rufinus), L. Vinicius (quo nemo civis rom. in agendis causis praesentius habuit ingenium, Sen. contr. II 13, 20; IIIvir monetalis a. 738 v. c. and in reference to this eleganter dixit divus Augustus: L. Vinicius ingenium in numerato habet, ib.; a specimen ib. 19), and his brother (ib. 19) P. Vinicius (exactissimi vir ingenii, qui nec dicere res ineptas nec ferre poterat, ib. VII 20. p. 217, 3 sqq. Bu.; summus amator Ovidii, ib. X 33, 25; a specimen ib. I 2, 3; against him see Sen. Epist. 40, 9. Consul 755 v. c.; see A. Haakh in Pauly's Encycl. VI 2. p. 2627 sq. nr. 4 and 5); Votienus Montanus (see below 271, 1).

11. A certain Popilius Lenas is mentioned as a rhetorician and the author of rhetorical works by Quintil. X 7, 32 cf. III 1, 21. XI 3, 183 (quod a Graecis sumptum P. L. posuit). He probably lived as late as Tiberius; cf. below 275, 1.

12. Porphyrio on Hor. Ep. I 5, 9: Moschus hic Pergamenus rhetor notissimus, reus veneficii fuit, cuius causam ex primis tunc oratores egerunt, Torquatus (see above 262, 2.) hic de quo nunc dicit (Horatius), cuius extat oratio, et Asinius Pollio. Cf. Sen. controv. II 13, 13: novi declamatores post Moschum Apollodoreum, qui reus veneficii fuit et a Pollione Asinio defensus, damnatus Massiliae docuit. Hence it seems that he wrote in Greek, like Artemon, Damas, Diocles, Euctemon, Glycon Spiridion, Hybreas, Nicetes, Potamon and others mentioned by Suetonius.

264. Nearly the whole of the eighth century v. c. was embraced by the life of Annaeus Seneca of Corduba, the father of Novatus, Seneca the philosopher, and of Mela, the father of Lucan. A man of genuine Roman severity and straightforwardness, of sober judgment, and in point of style an admirer of Cicero, he himself does not appear to have held a high position among the refined speakers of his time. But, besides an historical work, he composed in his later years, a survey of the themes commonly treated in the schools, 10 books of controversiae and one book of suasoriae, under the title of oratorum et rhetorum sententiae, divisiones, colores, which bears witness to his wonderful memory, and is a rich store-house for the history of rhetoric under Augustus and Tiberius. We possess this work with considerable gaps. Some of them are filled up by a still extant abridgment (Excerpta) made in the fourth or fifth century of the Christian era.

1. The praenomen in part of the mss. (especially the Bruxell.) is Lucius, which may be owing to confusion with the son, but may also be right. Since the time of Raph. Volaterranus M. has been arbitrarily as-

med. The family were of equestrian rank (Tac. A. XIV 53) and well-off (Sen. ad Helv. 14, 3). Their home was Corduba, see Martial I 61, 7 sq. (duosque Senecas . . facunda loquitur Corduba). His personal character. Sen. ad Helv. matr. 17, 3 sq.: patris mei antiquus rigor. . . utinam . . pater meus, minus maiorum consuetudini deditus, voluisset te praeceptis sapientiae erudiri potius quam inbui! . . propter istas quae litteris non ad sapientiam utuntur, sed ad luxuriam instruuntur, minus te indulgere studiis passus est. This agrees with such expressions as controv. I praef. 6 (insolens Graecia) and 8 sq. (cantandi saltandique obscena studia etc.). 6, 12 (valde levis et graeca sententia). X 33, 23 (latinam linguam facultatis non minus habere, licentiae minus than the Greek).

2. The period. Controv. I praef. 11: omnes magni in eloquentia nominis excepto Cicerone videor audisse; ne Ciceronem quidem aetas mihi eripuerat, sed bellorum civilium furor, qui tunc orbem totum pervagabatur, intra coloniam meam me continuit; alioquin in illo atriolo in quo duos grandes praetextatos ait secum declamare solitos potui adesse illudque ingenium . . cognoscere et . . potui vivam vocem audire. He appears, therefore, to have been born a. 700 at the very latest. He died c. 792, see note 5. He certainly did not live when his son was exiled (a. 786); see L. Sen. ad Helv. 2, 4 sq. He twice stayed at Rome; contr. IV praef. 3: audivi illum (Asinius Pollio, a. 679—758) et viridem et postea iam senem. His accurate knowledge of the Roman rhetoricians of that period shows that his sojourn always lasted for some time. His masters (see above 263, 2 and 10) and friends (above 263, 2 and 7) lived there. At a mature age he married at Corduba Helviam, bene in antiqua et severa institutam domo, Sen. ad Helv. 16, 3; cf. ib. 2, 4: carissimum virum, ex quo mater trium liberorum eras, extulisti. The eldest of them was (comp. n. 4) Novatus (see above 263, 7), the second the philosopher L. Seneca (below 282, 1); for the third, Mela, see Tac. A. XVI 17, cf. Polyaen. VIII 62.

3. His works. L. Seneca de vita patris (III p. 436 sq. Hse): si quaecumque composuit pater meus et edi voluit iam in manus populi emisissem, ad claritatem nominis sui satis sibi ipse prospexerat; nam nisi me decipit pietas, . . inter eos haberetur qui ingenio meruerunt ut puris scriptorum titulis nobiles essent. quisquis legisset eius historias ab initio bellorum civilium . . paene usque ad mortis suae diem, magni aestimaret scire quibus natus esset parentibus ille qui res romanas (so excellently described). This historical work appears to have been inedited at that time. From this work may be taken the statement on the death of Tiberius, Suet. Tib. 73 (Seneca cum scribit, unless his son be meant), and Lactant. instit. VII 15, 14 (non inscite Seneca romanae urbis tempora distribuit in aetates). The reference in Quintil. IX 2, 98 (est a Seneca dictum eleganter, non patronorum hoc esse — swearing — sed testium) suits neither the existing work of the father nor any one of the son's works.

4. His extant work. Controv. I praef.: Seneca Novato, Senecae, Melae filiis salutem. (1.) Exigitis rem magis iocundam mihi quam facilem: iubetis enim quid de his declamatoribus sentiam qui in aetatem meam inciderunt indicare et si qua memoriae meae nondum elapsa sunt ab illis dicta colligere. . . est, fateor, iocundum mihi redire in antiqua studia melioresque ad annos respicere etc. (2.) sed cum multa iam mihi . . senectus fecerit, oculorum aciem retuderit, aurium sensum hebetaverit, nervorum firmitatem fatigaverit, inter ea quae retuli (retinui?) memoria est. . . hanc aliquando in me floruisse, ut . . in miraculum quoque usque procederet, non nego: nam et duo milia nominum recitata quo erant ordine dicta reddebam etc. (3.) . . ex parte bene spero (concerning the account desired); nam quaecumque apud illam aut puer aut iuvenis deposui quasi recentia aut modo audita sine cunctatione profert. . . (4.) ita ex memoria quantum vobis satis sit superest. . . illud necesse est impetrem, ne me quasi certum aliquem ordinem velitis sequi in contrahendis quae mihi occurrunt. (5.) . . necesse est me ad delicias componam memoriae meae. (10.) quaecumque a celeberrimis viris facunde dicta teneo, ne ad quemquam privatim pertineant, populo dedicabo (so that it would appear to have been published before his death). (13.) facile est mihi ab incunabulis nosse rem post me natam (i. e. declamatio). At the close (X praef. 1) he has the confession: sinite me ab istis iuvenilibus studiis ad senectutem meam reverti. fatebor vobis, iam res taedio est. primo libenter adsilui, velut optimam vitae meae partem mihi reducturus; deinde me iam pudet, tamquam diu non seriam rem agam. Yet he added to the controversiae; see controv. II 12, 8: quae dixerit suo loco reddam, cum ad suasorias venero. He never completed them; see suas. 6, 27: si hic desiero, scio futurum ut vos . . desinatis legere. . . ergo ut librum velitis usque ad umbilicum revolvere adiciam suasoriam proximae similem (nr. 7.).

5. The work was written in Seneca's senectus (see n. 4), after the death of Sejanus (a. 784; see suas. 2, 12) and of Scaurus (a. 787); see suas. 2, 22: Tuscus ille qui Scaurum Mamercum, in quo Scaurum familia extincta est, maiestatis reum fecerat. The latest parts contain traces of events posterior to the death of Tiberius (+ March 790); see suas. 3, 7: Tiberius . . offendebatur Nicetis ingenio, also the statements on the accuser of Scaurus (suas. 2, 22), on the judicial burning of books (controv. X praef. 5 sq.), and the quotation from the work of Cremutius Cordus which was burnt under Tiberius, suas. 7, 19 sqq.

6. The controversiae are divided into ten books (libelli, II praef. 6, cf. IV praef. 1), always marked by prefaces in which one or several rhetoricians are characterized and which deserve reading both in point of form and subject. The prefaces to books 5, 6, and 8 are lost; that to b. 9 is not complete. In the single themes the writer generally observes the division according to sententiae (the opinions of the rhetoricians concerning the application of a law to a given case), divisio (distribution into single questions), and colores (disguises of a criminal

act); yet the manner of the work is free and easy, with numerous digressions. The accounts of the performances of the single rhetoricians are so much alike that they appear to be rendered merely in their general sense. There is a fair sprinkling of anecdotes and witticisms. The criticisms on individuals are sober and severe, sometimes even harsh. The author admires Cicero, see contr. I praef. 11. X praef. 6. The diction shows in the prefaces but few traces of the silver age, but more in the controversiae and suasoriae themselves.

7. Only one half of the ten books of controversiae — b. I, II, VII, IX and X, containing 35 themes — has come down to us, partly with gaps, especially when the sentences of Greek rhetoricians had been alleged in the original. A lost controversia is quoted by Quint. IX 2, 42 sq. In the fourth or fifth century of the Christian era a rather awkward (Bursian p. VII sq.) abridgment was made, which embraces also the lost works and has preserved the complete prefaces to b. I, II, III, and IV. The suasoriae are in the mss. placed before the controversiae, this being the gradation of school-instruction. The mss. of the unabridged original are derived from one and the same source, which was, however, itself depraved and incomplete. The most faithful copy of this archetype is the Brussels ms. 9594 saec. IX or X (B in Bursian's ed.), next to which comes the Antwerp ms. (A). The Excerpts exist in many mss., the oldest and best of which is at Montpellier (Montepessulanus) saec. X (M in Bursian's ed.). The epitomator had before him a copy different from the original of our mss. See Bursian's praef. p. IX—XX. The work was employed in the Gesta Romanorum, L. Friedländer in the Ind. lect. of Königsberg, 1871 sq., p. IV sq.

8. In the earliest editions (e. g. Venet. 1490. 1492 fol. Basle 1515. 1529 fol. and 1539. 1557 fol., by Erasmus), the father's work is mixed up with the works of his son; it was not separated before the editions of Nic. Faber (Paris 1587. 1598 fol.), and Andr. Schott (Paris 1607. 1613. fol.); by J. Fr. Gronovius (Lugd. Bat. 1649) and cum notis variorum ex rec. Gronov., Amsterdam 1672. A text in the Bipont edition, 1783. The first critical edition, rec. et emend. Conr. Bursian, Lips. 1857. Recogn. A. Kiessling, Lips. (Teubner). 1872. Critical contributions by H. Höfig (de Sen. rhet. quattuor codd. mss. Schottianis, Görlitz 1858. 4.), J. Vahlen (Rhein. Mus. XIII p. 546—564), A. Kiessling (ib. XVI p. 50—61 and in his Contributions to the criticism of Latin prose-writers, Basle and Geneva 1864, p. 32—47, and in the Program of the Hamburg Johanneum, 1871). Herm. Müller (Rhein. Mus. XXI p. 405—428. Berlin. Ztschr. f. Gymn. 1868, p. 81—93. 715 sq. Cf. 490 sq.), Cl. Konitzer (ibid. p. 966—970; Quaest. in Sen. patrem criticae, Breslau 1864, and Contributions to the criticism of the rhetorician Seneca Breslau 1866. 4.), R. Wachsmuth (Quaest. crit. in Sen. rh., Posen 1867. 4.), O. Rebling (Observatt. critt. in S. patrem, Götting. 1868), M. Haupt (Hermes III p. 344 sq.), C. Bursian (Spicilegium crit. in Sen. libris suas, et contr., Zürich 1869. 4.).

9. J. Körber, on the rhetorician Seneca (p. 1—23. 58—66) and the Roman rhetoric of his age (p. 23—58). Marburg 1864.

265. Coincident with the latter part of the life of Seneca was probably the rhetorician P. Rutilius Lupus, the author of two extant books of schemata lexeos, being an abridged translation of one of Gorgias' works on the figures of speech, but which seem to have formed only part of the original work.

1. Though Seneca never mentions Rutilius Lupus, this does not prove that he did not know him, but rather may be explained from the design of his work; see controv. I praef. 4: neque de his me interrogatis quos ipsi audistis, sed de his qui ad vos usque non pervenerunt. That Rutilius wrote before Celsus, appears from Quintil. IX 2, 102: praeter illa quae Cicero inter lumina posuit sententiarum multa alia et Rutilius, Gorgian secutus, non illum Leontinum, sed alium sui temporis (who at Athens taught young Cicero, ad fam. XVI 21, 6 in a. v. c. 710), cuius quattuor libros in unum suum transtulit (which shows that the division into two books is of later origin), et Celsus, videlicet Rutilio accedens, posuerunt schemata. Cf. also ib. 101. 106 (Rutilius sive Gorgias). 3, 36. 84. 89 (qui proprie libros huic operi — i. e. rhetorical figures — dedicaverunt, ut Caecilius, Dionysius, Rutilius, Cornificius, Visellius). 91—94. 99. Lupus was perhaps the son of the partisan of Pompey who bore the same name, (Pauly's Encycl. VI 1. p. 588, nr. 14).

2. The extant work gives a full idea of the unnecessary and minute number of oratorical figures of later rhetoric, in which Gorgias seems to have either been independent or to have availed himself of other sources unknown to us, his lists and terms possessing many peculiarities of their own (Dzialas, quaest. p. 15—21). His small work is valuable chiefly for the numerous and well-translated examples taken from Greek orators, mostly lost now. That the Greek original was abridged in the process of translation appears from II 12: quid intersit . . cognoscere poteris . . multo diligentius ex graeco Gorgiae libro, ubi pluribus uniuscuiusque ratio redditur.

3. That the work in its present shape is incomplete, appears both from the oratorical figures (*σχήματα διανοίας*) quoted by Quintilian IX 2, 103. 106 (cf. 3, 89) from Rutilius, though they are not found in the present work, and from the title of the treatise in the mss.: P. Rutilii Lupi schemata dianoeas ex Graeco vorsa Gorgia, the extant part relating only to the *σχήματα λέξεως*. The title may, therefore, originally have been: schemata dianoeas et lexeos ex graecis Gorgiae versa (Ruhnken). Cf. Dzialas Quaest. p. 14 sq. 28 sqq. In this state of affairs, the conjecture of Dzialas (ib. p. 36—38) has little foundation: Rutilii librum quem nos habemus non esse e manu Rutilii profectum, sed magistri alicuius epitomen. The author of the carmen de

figuris knew only the present extent of the work, even with the gap between I 5 and 6; see Dzialas p. 15—28. On the supplement furnished for this gap by C. Schöpper (Quedlinburg 1849) see F. Haase, de fragmentis Rutilio Lupo a Schöpfero suppositis, Breslau 1856. 4.

4. Editions. Venet. 1519. Ald. 1523. By B. Rhenanus, Basil. 1521. 4.; R. Stephanus, Paris 1530. 4. In the Rhetores antiqui of Fr. Pithoeus (Paris 1599. 4.), Capperonnier (Strasburg 1756. 4.) and especially the Rhetores latini minores of C. Halm (Lips. 1863) p. 3—21. Rec. et annot. adi. D. Ruhnken, Lugd. Bat. 1768 (Lips. 1831). In us. schol. explanavit F. Jacob, Lübeck 1837.

5. Critical contributions by J. Mähly (Philologus XIV p. 764—768), G. Fröhlich (Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 89 p. 202—208), J. Simon (Philologus XXVII p. 642—659) and others.

6. G. Dzialas, Quaestiones Rutilianae, Diss. Breslau (1860), and Rhetorum antiquorum de figuris doctrina (Breslau 1869. 4.). C. Schmidt, de Rutilio Lupo, Breslau 1865. 4.

00065180

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018